



HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD

917 Lakeridge Way • PO Box 43430 • Olympia, Washington 98504-3430 • (360) 753-7800 • (360) 753-7808 • TDD (360) 753-7809

**STATE OF WASHINGTON
PRELIMINARY BOARD MEETING AGENDA
Glacier Room, Student Union Bldg.
Green River Community College
12401 SE 320th St., Auburn
December 7, 1998**

**Approximate
Times**

Tab

8:30 a.m. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

- Bob Craves, HECB Chair

Welcome from President Richard Rutkowski, Green River CC

Approval of HECB Minutes, Oct. 28, 1998

1

Budget Update

2

- HECB staff briefing
- 1. Supplemental budget requests
 - (*Resolution 98-46*)
- 2. EWU budget adjustment
 - (*Resolution 98-47*)
- 3. Rural Areas Study: Postsecondary Education Needs of Okanogan and Jefferson counties
 - (*Resolution 98-48*)

Spokane Higher Education Services Studies Reports

3

- HECB staff briefing
- (*Resolution 98-50*)

10:00 a.m. B R E A K

Governor's 2020 Commission on the Future of Higher Education

4

- Panel discussion
- (*Resolution 98-60*)

12:00 p.m. L U N C H (Baker Room, Student Union Building)

- No official action will be taken at lunch

1:00 p.m.	Competency-based Admissions Report to Legislature <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HECB staff briefing • <i>(Resolution 98-53)</i> 	5
	Accountability Report / Recommendations to Legislature <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fiscal subcommittee & staff briefing • Panel of representatives from four-year college & universities • <i>(Resolution 98-49)</i> 	6
	2000 Master Plan Process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subcommittee discussion • <i>(Resolution 98-51)</i> 	7
	HECB Legislative Agenda <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HECB staff briefing • <i>(Resolution 98-52)</i> 	8
3:30 p.m.	<u>B R E A K</u>	
3:45 p.m.	Program Review Background <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HECB staff briefing 	
	Bachelor of Occupational Therapy, EWU <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>(Resolution 98-56)</i> 	9
	<u>C O N S E N T A G E N D A</u>	
	BS Natural Resource Sciences, WSU-Vancouver <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>(Resolution 98-54)</i> 	10
	MA in Rehabilitation Counseling, WWU <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>(Resolution 98-55)</i> 	11
	BA Interdisciplinary Studies/Organizational Leadership, EWU-Liberty Lake and EWU-Walla Walla <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>(Resolution 98-57)</i> 	12
	HECB 1999 Meeting Schedule <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>(Resolution 98-59)</i> 	13
	<u>DIRECTOR’S REPORT</u>	
	<u>STUDENT PANEL</u>	
	<u>PUBLIC COMMENT</u>	
5:00 p.m.	<u>CAMPUS TOUR</u>	

If you are a person with disability and require an accommodation for attendance, or need this

agenda in an alternative format, please call the HECB at (360) 753-7800 as soon as possible to allow sufficient time to make arrangements. We also can be reached through our Telecommunication Device for the Deaf at (360) 753-7809.

**HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING
October 28, 1998**

HECB Members Present

Mr. Bob Craves, Chair
Dr. Gay Selby
Mr. Jim Faulstich
Mr. Larry Hanson
Ms. Kristianne Blake
Ms. Ann Ramsay-Jenkins
Dr. Frank Brouillet
Dr. Chang Mook Sohn
Mr. David Shaw

HECB Staff

Mr. Marc Gaspard, Executive Director
Ms. Linda Schactler, Deputy Director
Mr. Bruce Botka, Dir. Governmental Relations
Ms. Becki Collins, Dir. Educational Services
Mr. Dan Keller, Senior Associate Director

Introductions

Mr. Bob Craves, HECB Chair, welcomed meeting participants and initiated Board introductions. Mr. Marc Gaspard, Executive Director, reviewed the agenda for the day.

Work Session: 1999-01 Operating & Capital Budget Recommendations

The meeting started with a two-hour work session on the 1999-01 operating and capital budget recommendations. Mr. Gaspard acknowledged the work of the two Board subcommittees:

- Fiscal Subcommittee - Gay Selby, David Shaw, Chang Mook Sohn, and Frank Brouillet
- Capital Subcommittee - Larry Hanson, Kristi Blake, and David Shaw.

Mr. Gaspard reviewed the process undertaken to reach the recommendations, starting with the HECB budget guidelines, followed by campus visits, meetings with the presidents and institutional representatives, subcommittee meetings, and staff discussions. He talked about the various policies and issues that were considered, including OFM Executive Director Dick Thompson's briefing to the Board on the budget implications of 1999-01 revenue projections and I-601 impacts. Mr. Gaspard concluded that statute presents a daunting challenge to the HECB: to review, to evaluate, and make budget recommendations guided by the Master Plan, weighing the role and mission of the public institutions against the Board's responsibility to serve the broader public interest above the interests of individual institutions.

Operating Budget

Dr. Selby thanked the other members of the Fiscal subcommittee and reviewed the major priorities that the subcommittee considered. Mr. Dan Keller, HECB Senior Associate Director, described the fiscal context of the upcoming biennium (budget requests significantly higher than expected revenues) and the major recommendations of the fiscal subcommittee.

- **Faculty salary increase of 4.5 percent per year** and an \$8 million recruitment and retention pool for the baccalaureate institutions.
- **\$40 million increase in financial aid funding** to implement the Board's new allocation recommendations for SNG;

- **Increase enrollment by 9639 FTE** (3639 at 4-year schools and 6,000 at two-year institutions);
- **Tuition increases** would be tied to the three-year average rate of the Per Capita Personal Income in Washington State (est. 4 percent and 3.2 percent for each year of the upcoming biennium), with institutional authority to increase tuition by up to 2 percent per year of the biennium. The latter is not to be ongoing or cumulative.

Capital Budget

Mr. Larry Hanson described the work of the Capital subcommittee, focusing on two areas: increasing enrollment and maintaining quality. He thanked Mr. Jim Reed, HECB Associate Director, for his good work and expert analysis of capital budget issues.

Mr. Gaspard presented the major points of the capital recommendations. He called attention to the multi-institution category that is the first of its kind in budget recommendations. The major recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature are as follows:

- 56 percent of available general obligation bond for higher education: about \$512 million;
- \$48 million in supplemental funding to respond to emergency needs in the two-year sector; and
- \$82 million in one-time appropriations from budget reserve accounts.

Both the Capital and Fiscal subcommittees organized their recommendations according to two broad categories: (1) “critical” funding needs, or those which if not funded would result in the deterioration of the system; and (2) “essential” funding needs, or those which are essential if the system is to continue to grow and improve.

Board discussion focused on current enrollment levels, peer comparisons, faculty salary increases, limitations of Initiative 601, and implications of Referendum 49 on anticipated revenue.

Response/Reaction from Institutional Representatives

Mr. Craves invited representatives from the four-year public institutions and the community college system to give their reactions to the budget recommendations. Institutions were generally supportive of the recommendations, particularly proposed faculty salary increases. Dr. Fred Campbell, UW Vice Provost, described the budget recommendation as virtuous, courageous, and progressive.

Concern was expressed about tuition increases and the possibility that it would be compounded over the years. Dr. Selby stated that the Fiscal subcommittee had struggled for ways to increase revenue for the institutions, and figured that tuition increase was a good way to do that. She clarified that it is not the intent of the Board for the increases to become cumulative.

Representatives from the SBCTC brought up the concern about the Allied Health building, which is being recommended under the “Essential,” instead of “Critical” funding category.

Eastern Washington University President Stephen Jordan requested reconsideration of the priority categorization of one of its 1999-2001 biennium budget request items, namely that

for Facilities Operation and Maintenance. Dr. Selby said the Fiscal Subcommittee would reconsider its categorization of that request.

The Board unanimously approved the budget recommendations later in the afternoon.

ACTION: **Dr. Selby** moved for consideration of Resolution 98-41, 1999-2001 HECB Operating Budget Recommendations. **Dr. Brouillet** seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously.

Mr. Hanson moved for consideration of Resolution 98-42, 1999-2001 HECB Capital Budget Recommendations. **Ms. Ramsay-Jenkins** seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously.

Mr. Shaw moved for consideration of Resolution 98-43, 1997-99 Supplemental Capital Budget Recommendations. **Mr. Faulstich** seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously.

Mr. Faulstich moved for consideration of Resolution 98-44, UW Law School Building. **Mr. Hanson** seconded the motion. **Ms. Blake** abstained from voting due to conflict of interest. Resolution passed.

Mr. Hanson moved for consideration of Resolution 98-45, Spokane Health Sciences Building. **Ms. Blake** seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously.

Minutes of September 25, 1998, Meeting

Mr. Hanson moved for approval of the minutes as recorded. **Dr. Brouillet** seconded. The minutes were approved.

State Need Grant Study:

Dr. Selby introduced this item. After three years of study, research, analysis, and consultations with an advisory group; the tri-sector group representing the community and technical colleges, public and independent baccalaureate institutions; and legislative staff, the SNG report is concluded. The study presents a recommendation that SNGs be based on tuition rates, rather than cost of attendance.

Ms. Becki Collins, HECB Director for Education Services, summarized Resolution 98-40, which clarifies the intent of the SNG proposal, including the self-help requirement. An additional \$5 million would be required to implement the new grant amount based on 100 percent of tuition per student. Ms. Kristi Blake wished to know what would happen to the program if the additional 14

million for the biennium is not granted. Ms. Collins replied that although no student who is already on the program would be dropped, the level of service would be held at 50 percent of median family income.

Representatives from the tri-sector group expressed support for the proposal. Terry Teale, Executive Director for the Council of Presidents, commented that the proposal is "...a vast improvement on the current program." She said that working with HECB and the legislative staff had been "very good, resulting in a product "...that is very strong."

In connection with the SNG program, Antioch University requested changing the rules to allow students from institutions that are accredited elsewhere to be able to receive SNG grants. Dr. Selby remarked that this has implications for out-of-state schools that have branches here. After a brief discussion, it was decided that more research would have to be done before any action can be taken by the Board on this matter.

ACTION	Mr. Hanson moved for consideration of Resolution 98-40. Dr. Brouillet seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously.
---------------	---

Legislative Session Overview

Bruce Botka, HECB Director for Governmental Relations, led the Board through a comprehensive overview of the upcoming legislative session, including the budget and financial aid initiatives discussed above; changes to the higher education and accountability measures instituted in 1997. Other legislative issues that may surface include:

- Changes to or clarification of the foreign degree granting institutions statute;
- Ensuring the GET program continues to be the responsibility of the HECB;
- Reauthorization of tuition waivers for some veterans' groups;
- Changes to residency requirements for students at two-year colleges.

New Programs for Approval

Ms. Elaine Jones, HECB Program Associate, provided a brief review of the guidelines for new program approvals.

ACTION:	Mr. Hanson moved for consideration of Resolutions 98-35 to 98-39 under the consent agenda. Dr. Selby seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously. Res. 98-35: EWU, MSW / Everett Res. 98-36: WWU, BA in Education-Child Development / Silverdale Res. 98-37: CWU, BA in Asian Studies Res. 98-38: CWU, BS in Primate Behavior and Ecology Res. 98-39: CWU, Bachelor in Fine Arts
----------------	--

Director's Report

Mr. Gaspard presented the following items:

- Draft of the 1999 Board Meeting Schedule, which the Board is expected to adopt in Dec.;
- Two recent publications from the HECB: Tuition Overview, and Higher Education Fact Book; and
- The HECB Internet web site address: www.hecb.wa.gov.

2020 Commission Report

Mr. Craves, who also co-chairs the Governor's 2020 Commission, announced that the Commission's report would be officially given to the Governor on Nov. 10, followed by a press conference. The Commission members will be invited to address the Board at its meeting in December.

The meeting adjourned at 5 p.m. followed by dinner with the six presidents of the state's baccalaureate institutions.

Proposed 1999 Supplemental Budget Recommendations

December 1998

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

OVERVIEW

At the last Board meeting staff noted that supplemental budget requests for the 1999 session of the Legislature were not submitted in time to be part of the overall budget process for the 1999-2001 biennium. This was not the fault of the institutions but simply due to the fact that the OFM timelines for submittal of supplemental requests did not allow time for the Board's review process. The Board's desire was then to consider the supplemental requests at the December meeting, after the Fiscal Subcommittee had had an opportunity to review the requests.

Three of the four-year institutions and the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges submitted requests for supplemental budgets. Table 1 following is a summary of those requests. Table 2 presents an overview of the latest State General Fund status for your information.

The Board's Fiscal Subcommittee met in Olympia on November 16 to consider the supplemental budget requests. The Subcommittee recommends the requests be approved, as submitted, by the full Board for recommendation to the Governor and to the Legislature for funding. To the extent that funding may not be available this fiscal year because of statutory state expenditure limitations, those requests of an on-going nature should be considered for funding during the 1999-2001 biennium.

Attached as an appendix are the supplemental requests as they were submitted by the three of the four-year institutions and the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges. They have been altered only to the extent of adding the pagination in the lower right-hand corner. Not all institutions submitted requests.

RECOMMENDATION

The 1999 supplemental operating budget proposal developed by the HECB Fiscal Subcommittee is recommended for approval.

TABLE 1
PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL OPERATING BUDGETS
State General Fund

University of Washington

i. Critical Mass Internet2 Gigapop and
Faculty Cluster

This funding request is to build out and staff operation of the Next Generation Internet2 Gigapop hub to serve education, health care, and business needs in the state. Also requested is funding for a core cluster of faculty to make use of this new capability to advance research and development in computer science.

Funding requested: \$3,538,000

ii. Seismic Network

The requested funding would be used to create a center for developing an enhanced seismic network along with analytical and reporting capabilities.

Funding requested: \$971,000

Central Washington University

i. Lynnwood Lease Cost Increase

Lease costs at the CWU center in Lynnwood have unexpectedly increased during the current biennium for additional required space and increased square footage costs.

Funding requested: \$206,158

ii. Y2K Program

To ensure there are no interruptions of vital services as a result of the year 2000 change-over, CWU requests funding for assessment, testing, and mitigation of electrical, electronic, and life safety systems on campus.

Funding requested: \$1,853,150

Western Washington University

i. NSIS Start-up

WWU has requested funding to put an NSIS administrative office in place before the end of the biennium to ensure programs can start as early as possible in the next academic year.

Funding requested: \$ 87,000

ii. Off-Campus Leases

To accommodate enrollment increases WWU has begun leasing office space near campus into which it can move functions that can operate away from the academic core.

Funding requested: \$138,180

TABLE 1 (cont'd)

iii. ADA Support

WWU has experienced greater than anticipated enrollment of students requiring services required under the provisions of the American Disabilities Act (ADA).

Funding requested: \$76,000

iv. Comprehensive Land Use Consultant Costs

For the first time, the state capital budget act requires WWU to comply with local comprehensive land use laws. To do so WWU has had to engage consultant services for which no provision was made in its budget.

Funding requested: \$76,000

v. Teacher Education Outreach

In cooperation with the Cascade Consortium in Chelan and Okanogan counties, WWU proposes expansion of its teacher education outreach to future educators program.

Funding requested: \$50,000

State Board for Community and Technical Colleges

The SBCTC proposes to upgrade the system's student and management information systems. These computing systems include the Student Management System for registration, grades, enrollment tracking and reporting; the Student Financial Aid System; the Financial Management System for budgeting, accounting, inventory, etc; and the Human Resources Management System for personnel and payroll management and reporting. The upgrade will occur over a five year period and cost a total of \$20 million. The SBCTC will redirect \$11 million from existing funds and requests a one-time appropriation to meet the balance of the costs.

Funding requested: \$9,000,000

APPENDIX

**1999 SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET REQUEST
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON - AGENCY 360**

REQUEST NO. I CRITICAL MASS INTERNET2 GIGAPOP & FACULTY CLUSTER

I. SUMMARY

		FY 1999			
Program	Supplemental Item	FTEs	Dollars	Fund Source	
040 Academic Support	Internet 2	1.5	3,538,000	Fund 001	

II. DETAIL

Narrative

In the last legislative session, the UW. made Internet2 based requests for matching and startup funding to keep the State from being left out of the nation's next generation Internet infrastructure. The legislature funded what was agreed to be the minimum required for an attempt to get high speed Internet connectivity brought into the northwest, with the understanding that the UW should come back for the rest of the required funding if and when we were successful in getting the federal research networks brought into Seattle. Happily, the UW and its Gigapop partners have met with spectacular success, and that success has come almost a full year earlier than imagined. The UW is now connected to both of the nation's premier high speed networks: the National Science Foundation "very high performance Backbone Network Service (vBNS)" and the even faster Internet2 "Abilene" network. Both of these networks have not only been brought into Seattle, but they have been "hubbed out" of the Gigapop, and put into skeleton operation.

This budget request is designed to achieve two goals. The first goal is to build out the sustaining core of the Internet2 (I2) "Next Generation Internet" Gigapop hub serving education, health care and business in the State. The UW needs to complete the buildout and staffing of the Gigapop in order to accomplish four things:

- to achieve the core critical mass needed for the UW and others in the area and state to build upon
- to enable creation and operation of the required local gigabit speed testbed
- to enable regional participation
- to allow us all to compete in next year's rounds of competition for federally funded "next generation Internet" based application, content and regional connections.

To accomplish this, the UW must not only staff, equip and build out the Gigapop, but we must also extend gigabit speed connections and the requisite experimental equipment into key network and network application groups 'in Computer Science and Engineering at the UW campus. Connecting these key groups to the Gigapop will allow them to begin research and development work that will feed into competitive proposal processes. The UW also needs to quickly interconnect key research medicine and health science teams and apparatus to the gigabit speed infrastructure.

The second goal is to leverage the extraordinary success of activating the internet2 Gigapop hub. Due to the UW's ability to be one of the first major operational Gigapops in the country, and the first with a true local gigabit testbed, we also have an extraordinary window of opportunity to quickly expand the UW's world class but very small Computer Science group. - 'Me University of Washington proposes to create a core faculty cluster in next generation telecommunication, digital multimedia and 'immersive' network environments. This faculty cluster will put the State at the forefront of truly economically strategic areas of computer science research and development. This proposal will selectively build added and crucial expertise and research capacity in key areas of network and multimedia based technology transfer. These are critical areas to both the State and the UW economic development opportunity for the entire region.

By moving quickly to consolidate our gains and to establish a true national leadership position here at the UW and in the State of Washington, we will create not only a tremendous learning and research resource, but also a potentially enduring competitive advantage for institutions across the entire state.

	FY 1999	1999-2001 Bowwave
1. Operating Expenditures		
Fund 001	3,538,000	3,950,000
2. Staffing		
Total FTEs – Fund 001	1.5	11.5*
3. Objects of Expenditure		
A – Salaries	259,000	2,275,000
B – Benefits	58,000	512,000
E – Operations	425,000	1,163,000
J – Equipment	2,796,000	-0-
Total Expenditures	3,538,000	3,950,000

* This includes 6.0 FTE for faculty and 5.5 FTE for Support Staff.

REQUEST NO. 02 SEISMIC NETWORK

III. SUMMARY'

IV. DETAIL

Narrative

The Problem

Large, damaging earthquakes will take place in the Puget Sound region. They will likely cause many casualties and tremendous economic disruption. In the Pacific Northwest, many parties need greatly improved information on the location, intensity and effects of earthquakes. Critical industries and governmental agencies require authoritative and rapid knowledge of earthquake occurrences to properly initiate emergency plans (e.g., for utilities such as water, power, gas, bridges, mil, sewer, and for organizations such as Boeing, Microsoft, airports, and insurance companies).

Strong ground motion estimates, rapid notification and research do make a significant difference for improved engineering ahead of time and emergency response following an earthquake. Strong motion data are seriously lacking for the Puget Sound area. The geology and tectonics of this area are unique in the United States as well. The response of critical structures to these unique earthquakes is poorly understood and no data are available to document the responses of soils, bridges and buildings.

Seismologists at the University of Washington have ' been monitoring earthquakes for decades. Indeed, the UW officially operates the Pacific Northwest Seismograph Network (PNSN) with more than 106 monitoring stations throughout the region. Unfortunately, most of the equipment at those stations is thirty years old, has very limited capabilities by today's standards, and is essentially obsolete. They need to be replaced. Recent technological developments provide an opportunity to greatly enhance the breadth of scientific, engineering and societal impact of the monitoring effort at the UW. A new generation of instruments allows the routine recording of ground motion at the detailed level required for engineering studies. Computer hardware and software innovations now provide the opportunity to generate nearly "real time" information on the location and intensity of earthquakes. It may be possible, in some cases, to sound an alarm seconds prior to the initiation of strong ground motion in locations at a distance from the earthquake epicenter. Early predictions of damage can also be critical in planning disaster response even if the prediction comes shortly after the earthquake. Such new capabilities are being developed in the UW Geophysics Program.

The University of Washington and PNSN are already recognized as an authoritative source for information on earthquake and volcanic hazards in the region. The UW departments of Civil Engineering, which includes faculty who work on seismic behavior and design of structures and soils, and Geophysics are recognized as leaders in the study of earthquake hazard identification and mitigation. Pilot projects for both strong motion instrumentation and rapid earthquake notification are under way and receiving a great deal of interest from emergency management, utility and industrial groups. Last year the National Science Foundation awarded a major grant to a consortium that included several California universities and the UW. The Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center (PEER) creates a powerful new network for the study of earthquakes and the means to improve engineering and construction practices in order to mitigate the impacts of seismic events. The participation by the UW in PEER creates an excellent opportunity for a major advance in the study and response to potential seismic events in the Pacific Northwest. The timing is excellent to couple the new strategies being developed in PEER with the rebuilding of the obsolete state seismic network so as to contribute to the protection of the public generally and to protect the state's economic interests more particularly.

The current public demand for earthquake related education and information exceeds available University resources. The UW staff is no longer able to provide all of the outreach activities requested, particularly from other schools and universities. The UW is severely limited in the development of additional data sources and must turn down new research requests. Expanded funding is necessary to bridge the gap between the needs and the resources available.

The Proposal

The University proposes the creation of the Northwest Earthquake Reporting Center (NERC) to facilitate development of the needed enhanced seismic network and near-realtime analytical and reporting capability. The goals of the NERC will be to

- monitor ground motions at 100 locations;
- monitor 10 critical facilities;
- leverage Washington state funds with private and federal support to perform northwest earthquake monitoring, notification and research;
- disseminate educational information rapidly after a seismic event; and

- disseminate education information throughout the northwest, particularly to educational institutions and public entities.

By attaining these goals, NERC will improve understanding of issues that are vital to the public safety and economic vitality of Washington State. The University of Washington believes it is the proper locus for this organization as it is uniquely positioned to deliver this public service, education and research.

The role of the NERC will be to

- help to establish and set priorities for operational and research activities with external partners (emergency managers, utilities, industries, press, K-20 schools and the public);
- coordinate the development of the delivery mechanisms for rapid earthquake information to the groups who can best use it and help with their education in its most effective use;
- provide a mechanism to obtain operational and research support (both dollars and "in kind services") from the external partners (private industry, federal agencies, local public agencies); and
- provide the resources for A greatly expanded outreach program, particularly to other schools and universities in the state.

In addition to the goals and role of the NERC mentioned above, UW faculty and students in many areas (e.g., earth sciences, social policy, engineering, materials science, and physics) will provide greatly enhanced research and educational activities. The network and its data (as well as its design and maintenance) will augment undergraduate education and opportunities for participation in research.

The availability of the new gigapop site at the UW and the state's extensive K-20 network makes the expansion and enhancement of the state's seismic network all the more feasible and powerful. The proposed expanded outreach initiative would involve the installation of network stations into many K-20 school-, community colleges and industrial sites in Washington. Data from these instruments will be collected and analyzed as part of the NERC operations then returned, along with appropriate interpretation, to the participating hosts for their use in education and hazard mitigation. Schools will receive equipment and training to operate local seismograph stations and to send and receive their data and analysis results via the Internet. The interactions spawned by partnerships with the K-20 systems will contribute greatly to educational outreach efforts as well as enhancing the research made possible by these added sites. This represents a wonderful synergy between two public goods: the K-20 network for educational purposes and the Seismic Network for monitoring, reporting and research.

Industrial participants will be asked to contribute financially to the purchase and operation of instruments located at their sites as well as the infrastructure for collecting and processing data-

The NERC could make a dramatic change in the level of sophistication of the seismic network in the state and serve as the nexus for a dynamic education, research and public service program in the state and region. The seismic monitoring capabilities in the state will have to be expanded significantly regardless of whether the NERC is created and funded. It will either be done piecemeal and in an uncoordinated way that will not serve the state's and the public interests at all well nor the research enterprise, or it can be done systematically to provide a highly valuable resource for the state, the public and the private sector. Given the enormous assets at stake, to

say nothing of public safety, this seems like a modest and urgent investment for the state to make, the benefits of which would resonate far and wide.

Fiscal Detail

The UW requests \$971,000 per year **in** state funding for FY 1999 through FY 2002 to get the NERC system designed, installed, equipped and operating. These funds will provide staff and operations support and one-half of the equipment and installation costs necessary to meet the goals and role of the NERC outlined above. The USGS and private sources will fund the other 50% of the equipment and installation costs. The Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center will support research on northwest earthquake engineering problems if matching funds are provided from within Washington State. This request includes \$200,000 in state matching funds for research projects such as those supported by PEER. Indeed, matching is required as a condition of receiving PEER funding.

After FY 2002, it is anticipated that approximately \$500,000 per year will be required on a permanent basis to maintain the NERC from FY 2003. forward. The University will return an annual amount of approximately \$471,000 to the state general fund in FY 2003.

	FY 1999	1999-2001 Bowwave
1. Operating Expenditures		
Fund 001	971,000	1,942,000
2. Staffing		
Total FTEs – Fund 001	6.0	6.0
3. Objects of Expenditure		
A – Salaries	262,000	524,000
B – Benefits	59,000	118,000
E – Operations	100,000	200,000
J – Equipment	350,000	700,000
Total Expenditures	971,000	1,942,000

**1999 SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET REQUEST
CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY**

I. SUMMARY

Program	Supplemental Item	Dollars	Fund Source
010	Lynnwood Lease Cost Increase	206,158	GF State
090	Y2K Program	1,853,150	GF State
	Total	2,059,308	GF State

II. DETAIL

Narrative

Lynnwood Lease Cost Increase

Lease costs at the Central Washington University Lynnwood Center will increase by \$208,657 annually, beginning in fiscal year 2000.

This request is for the incremental costs incurred from January 1, 1998, through June 30, 1999, and represents a cost and square footage increase.

Y2K Program

Year 2000 Non-Information Technology funding was not requested in the 1997-1999 Budget Request due to the materiality of the problem not being identified at that time. In June of 1998 Central Washington University initiated the Y2K Non-Information Technology Program to identify, assess, and mitigate year 2000 issues. The goal is to ensure no interruption of vital public services or loss of accountability of public resources.

The Governor's Office and the Department of General Administration have enacted a statewide program to assess and mitigate non-information technology issues. Funding is critical for assessment, testing, and mitigation of electrical, electronic, and life safety systems on campus to be compliant with the Governor's mandate that no interruption of vital services going into the year 2000.

Current appropriations do not include funding for Y2K, emergent and legally mandated expenses. In order to be compliant with the Governor's mandate, inventory and vendor contact, data entry, testing and mitigation efforts must begin immediately.

In the event that supplemental funding is not approved, electrical systems, mainframe and personal computers, software, fire alarms, and building systems may fail or malfunction.

**1999 SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET REQUEST
WESTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY 3800**

I. Summary

Program	Supplemental Item	FY 1999 FTEs	Dollars	Fund Source
010	NSIS Administration Start-up	.83	206,158	GF State

II. Detail

Narrative

Western Washington University has been designated the Chair and Fiscal Agent for the North Snohomish Island, and Skagit higher education consortium (NSIS). The Higher Education Coordinating Board is considering recommendations that operating and capital appropriations be made to Western for the 1999-2001 biennium for NSIS. The capital appropriation will cover costs for preplanning, cost analysis, EIS, and master plan evaluation activities related to expanding Everett Community College, Edmonds Community College, and the Mount Vernon and Oak Harbor campuses of Skagit Valley College for both lower and upper division enrollment growth. In addition, the capital appropriation will support a comparative site specific EIS for permanent location of the Everett/Marysville College and University Center.

As. Fiscal Agent, Western will provide consortium program administration, program planning and policy development. Also, -Western will negotiate and implement leases for use of facilities at various consortium locations.

In this 1999 supplemental budget request, Western requests funding to begin establishing administrative resources required to serve as Chair and Fiscal Agent. The request is to fund six months of the chief administrative position and four months of an administrative assistant position, and provides operating support including basic equipment.

Without this start-up funding, the first six months of the 1999-01 biennium will be spent establishing the administrative support component rather than addressing the operating and capital requirements of the consortium. Additionally, one of the first tasks for the administrative team will be to work with participating institutions to employ a program coordinator at each of the six program sites. If the first six months of the biennium are spent establishing the administrative team, employment of program coordinators will not begin until the second half of the year. Thus it will be difficult to implement any kind of program until the second year of the biennium. Providing start-up -funding in the supplemental budget will result in more timely program development.

Fiscal Detail:		FY 1999
1. Operating Expenditures		\$87,000
2. Staffing: Total FTEs		.83
3. Objects of Expenditure:		

	Salaries and Wages	\$47,500
	Employee Benefits	\$12,500
	Goods and Services	\$10,000
	Travel	\$5,000
	Equipment	\$12,000
4.	Revenue	\$-0-

**1999 SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET REQUEST
WESTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY 3800**

I. Summary

Program	Supplemental Item	FY 1999 FTEs	Dollars	Fund Source
010	Off-campus Leases	-0-	\$138,180	001

II. Detail

Narrative

To accommodate enrollment growth, Western has begun leasing office space near campus into which the University can move functions that do not need to be located near the academic core. Currently, Western leases 7,785 square feet of office space in an office building near campus and has relocated functions (the largest being University Extended Programs and the Center for Regional Services) to that site. Total annual cost of the lease is \$138,180. The lease is entered into for a five-year term, until June 2003, in order to receive the best possible per square foot cost.

Funding for the lease comes from the University's state general fund appropriation. The University has had to redirect funds away from program support functions to fund the lease which will continue to be needed at least until completion of the next academic facility (the Communications Facility planned for completion for Fall Quarter, 2003) or: other capital resources become available.

Space capacity analysis indicates that Western currently has space deficits of 1500 classroom seats, 480 laboratory seats and 4 faculty offices. If enrollment growth continues at the present average rate of 250 FTE students per year, the deficits will increase to 2,300 classroom seats, 700 laboratory seats and 65 faculty offices by the end of the 2002-03 academic year. Thus, the strategy of acquiring leases to open space in the academic core to accommodate enrollment growth will need to be continued and expanded. Western's 1999-2001 operating budget request contains a decision package related to this need. This 1999 supplemental request is to provide funding for leases for this second year of the current biennium in order to offset funding transfers that impact academic support functions.

Fiscal Detail:		FY 1999
1.	Operating Expenditures	\$138,180
2.	Staffing: Total FTEs	-0-
3.	Objects of Expenditure:	
	Goods and Services	\$138,180
4.	Revenue	\$-0-

**1999 SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET REQUEST
WESTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY 3800**

I. Summary

Program	Supplemental Item	FY 1999 FTEs	Dollars	Fund Source
060	ADA Support	-0-	\$26,000	001

II. Detail

Narrative

In compliance with -American Disabilities Act (ADA) mandates, Western has undertaken an initiative to improve physical access to facilities, equipment and learning resources. Specially abled students currently comprise three percent of enrollment Sixty-two percent of those students have learning difficulties that require individual assessment by and services of trained staff. 'Me number of students with severe disabilities has nearly doubled over the past two years. Support - is needed to -determine appropriate accommodations for these students and to work with faculty to ensure classroom arrangements are made to address these issues.

To comply with basic ADA requirements,' the University has had to shift resources from primary program support. Last year the University budgeted \$25,000 for these services, but our actual costs for services were twice that. Western added an additional \$25,000 to this year's budget for ADA services, but again, our actual costs are projected to top \$76,000 for this fiscal year. In this supplemental budget, Western requests funding to meet disability accommodation mandates required by ADA for the 1998-99 fiscal year. This includes basic program support services provided by classified staff and graduate students, and professional services for interpreters, Braille transcriptions, real-time captioning, note taking and scribes.

Fiscal Detail:		FY 1999
1.	Operating Expenditures	\$76,000
2.	Staffing: Total FTEs	1.5
3.	Objects of Expenditure:	
	Salaries and Wages	\$20,000
	Employee Benefits	\$3,000
	Contracted Services	\$45,000
	Goods and Services	\$2,000
	Equipment	\$6,000
4.	Revenue	\$-0-

**1999 SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET REQUEST
WESTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY 3800**

I. Summary

Program	Supplemental Item	FY 1999 FTEs	Dollars	Fund Source
080	Comprehensive land use consultant fees	-0-	\$70,000	001

II. Detail

Narrative

For the first time, Western's 1997-99 Capital Budget appropriation contained the language that "the University shall comply with local comprehensive land use laws and regulations" for specific projects. Participating in the City of Bellingham's comprehensive planning process has required significant expenditure of time and resources that were not previously required for capital project planning and implementation. The University will continue to devote significant amounts of personnel time and effort to meet with city and neighborhood groups to develop capital plans and implement capital projects.

Dealing with city and state comprehensive land use laws and regulations requires specific legal expertise. To assure compliance with local and state laws and to best represent the interests of the State, the University found it necessary to contract @ or consultant services. To compensate for these expenses, Western requests reimbursement for 1997-99 consultant costs related to this process.

Fiscal Detail:		FY 1999
1.	Operating Expenditures	\$76,000
2.	Staffing: Total FTEs	-0-
3.	Objects of Expenditure:	
	Contracted Services	\$76,000
4.	Revenue	\$-0-

**1999 SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET REQUEST
WESTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY 3800**

I. Summary

Program	Supplemental Item	FY 1999 FTEs	Dollars	Fund Source
010	Teacher Education Outreach	-0-	\$50,000	001

II. Detail

Narrative

Western's Woodring College of Education (WCE).has developed a program proposal that is responsive to the "Report and Recommendations" of the Technology in Education Task Force. The program involves a partnership between WCE and the Cascade Consortium working together to assist in the development of a Remote Electronic Practicum (REP) by using advanced video conferencing and Web. technologies. The REP will allow the college to expand its teacher education outreach to future educators in the Cascade Consortium which consists of all the community public K-12 schools, hospitals, and public libraries in Chelan and Okanogan counties.

The REP program will offer the opportunity to allow future teachers from the communities within the Cascade Consortium to return to their home regions to student teach. This will assist rural districts to recruit students from their local communities. The REP will also facilitate continuing education of practicing teachers who live in these rural areas.

The University is seeking this program funding for three primary purposes:

1. Install a high speed data connection between WWU and the Secondary Network Access Point in Seattle. The consortium will match Western's funding efforts by installing the link from the consortium to Seattle.
2. Purchase and install a high-speed CODEC at WWU for compressing and delivering video over the T- I connection.
- 3 . Prepare and deliver a remote electronic practicum to a cohort of K-12 teachers in the consortium using a combination of instructional delivery modalities including two-way video conferencing, asynchronous discussion groups, realtime video conferencing and other technologies including the K-20 network.

In addition to the requested funding by the University, the Cascade Consortium is prepared to match the proposal with in-land goods and services. Through this program future teachers will have the opportunity to participate in classes that will be delivered through advanced technologies thus exposing these teachers to the benefits of technology assisted education. Faculty participating in this project will have the opportunity to learn how to develop and deliver courses using these technologies.

Fiscal Detail:		FY 1999
1.	Operating Expenditures	\$50,000
2.	Staffing: Total FTEs	-0-
3.	Objects of Expenditure:	
	Goods and Services	\$24,000
	Travel	\$2,000
	Equipment	\$24,000
4.	Revenue	\$-0-

STATE BOARD FOR COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES 1999 SUPPLEMENTAL OPERATING BUDGET REQUEST

The community and technical college system has a good reputation for efficient and effective management and accountability. That reputation is partly attributable to the student and management information systems created and operated by the college system's Center for Information Systems (CIS). Early in the college system's history a consortium was formed to provide computing services in an efficient and cost effective manner. The computer applications developed and maintained by the consortium include:

- Student Management System (Registration, grades, enrollment tracking and reporting)
- Student Financial Aid System
- Financial Management System (budgeting, accounting, inventory, facilities)
- Human Resources Management System (personnel, payroll)

These systems were developed in-house in the mid-1980s. The underlying technology of these systems, both the hardware and software are outdated. This lack of modern capabilities severely limits access to services to students, faculty and staff. A good example is registering students enrolled in, college Internet courses. The existing computer system is incapable of accommodating on line registration of these students. We can teach on line, but we can't provide necessary support on line. The current systems are well beyond their intended life. These old legacy systems are inflexible, unforgiving, unresponsive, patched together by years of reprogramming, and inadequate to deliver the kinds of services students and staff expect. The colleges and state board need modern computer systems that embody the following concepts:

- Relational databases
- Graphical User Interfaces
- Web Centric services
- Open systems
- Electronic Data Interface

The need for upgraded computer systems has been evident to the colleges and the state board for a number of years. Our first attempt to address the problem was to internally redevelop and overhaul of all of the computer applications. This was found to impractical given the tremendous changes in the technology and tools and the limited amount of in-house staff resources. A second attempt sought to develop a partnership with private entities to develop applications. This too proved inadequate because the colleges had inadequate financial resource to bring to the table. The third alternative and the basis for this funding request is to acquire a proven, integrated solution from a higher education software vendor. The Acquisition Plan was submitted to the Information Services Board in June 1988, reviewed and approved in July.

The cost of the new computer systems, including software, hardware, modification/enhancement, and implementation is estimated to be \$20 Million over the next five year period, The college system will redirect \$11 million (55%) from existing funds and are asking for the other \$9 Million (45%) to be provided by the legislature in a one-time supplemental appropriation.

Benefits of the new computer systems:

Students and faculty will have better, faster, more relevant information using Web based services. Student systems and administrative systems can work in conjunction with on-line instruction and library systems.

Data for decision making will improve. The canned reports of the current system are inadequate to provide managers information they need on a frequent basis to run the colleges. Student advising and student faculty interaction will be improved.

A more user friendly computer system will improve staff productivity and services to students and the public.

Fiscal Detail

Estimated costs:

Application Suite and Database Licenses	\$3,100,000,
Implementation Services	\$5,500,000
Enhancements	\$4,000,000
Software Maintenance	\$1,900,000
Hardware	\$3,500,000
Temporary Staffing (CIS)	\$2,000,000
Total	\$20,000,000 All expenditures from object ER

Source of Funds:

Fund 443 (Five years)	\$11,000,000
State General Fund 00 1	\$9,000,000
Total	\$20,000,000

Obviously this project will extend beyond the current fiscal year. We propose the funding be handled in the same manner as the \$17.8 Million supplemental appropriation in 1995. This onetime appropriation for college technology infrastructure was made at the end of the biennium to the state board; the expense was recorded as object ER. This funding technique was possible because the CIS consortium is an entity created by interlocal agreement, not a state agency. The unique funding mechanism used had the approval of the State Board, the Attorney General, the Office of Financial Management and of course, the legislature.

RESOLUTION NO. 9846

WHEREAS, Supplemental budget requests for the 1997-99 biennium have been submitted to the Higher Education Coordinating Board by the University of Washington, Western Washington University, Central Washington University, and the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges; and

WHEREAS, The HECB Fiscal Subcommittee met in Olympia on November 16, 1998, to consider the higher education supplemental budget requests; and

WHEREAS, The Fiscal Subcommittee has proposed to the Board that it recommend the requested supplemental budget requests to the Governor and to the Legislature;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board recommends the supplemental operating budget requests of the University of Washington, Central Washington University, Western Washington University, and the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges as submitted along with their carryforward costs; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, To the extent such supplemental budget requests are not funded by the Legislature for Fiscal Year 1999, they are recommended for consideration in the 1999-2001 biennium budget.

Adopted:

December 7, 1998

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

Proposed Revision to 1999 – 2001 Budget Recommendations

December 1998

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

On October 28, 1998, the Higher Education Coordinating Board reviewed institutional budget requests for the 1999-2001 biennium and adopted its recommendations thereon for submittal to the Governor and to the Legislature. As part of the budget review process, the Board invited institutional representatives to comment on the recommendations of the HECB Fiscal Subcommittee to the full Board.

Dr. Stephen Jordan, president of Eastern Washington University, asked the Board to consider revising the priority category proposed by the Subcommittee for two of the budget items requested by the EWU. He proposed that the item designated “Facilities Operation and Maintenance” be moved to the “Essential Support” priority category, and that a like amount from the overall “Technology Support and Renewal” request be designated at a lower priority

The Board referred Dr. Jordan’s request to the Subcommittee and asked that it review the matter and report back to the Board at the December 1998 meeting.

At its November 16 meeting in Olympia, the Fiscal Subcommittee reviewed EWU’s Facilities budget request item and agreed that it could be accorded a higher priority. It did not concur, however, that a portion of the Technology budget request item should be designated as a lower priority to offset the change. Each of the budget items should be prioritized on its merits and the Technology budget item is considered as Essential Support in its entirety.

RECOMMENDATION

The revised 1999-2001 biennium operating budget priority recommendations for Eastern Washington University proposed by the Fiscal Subcommittee is recommended for approval.

RESOLUTION NO. 98-47

WHEREAS, Eastern Washington University has requested of the Higher Education Coordinating Board reconsideration of the priority categorization of one of its 1999-2001 biennium budget request items, namely that for Facilities Operation and Maintenance; and

WHEREAS, The HECB Fiscal Subcommittee reviewed that request at a meeting in Olympia on November 16, 1998; and

WHEREAS, The Fiscal Subcommittee has proposed to the Board that it recommend to the Governor and to the Legislature a change in the operating budget priorities for Eastern Washington University previously adopted by the Board;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board adopts the recommendation of the Fiscal Subcommittee to accord the Facilities Operation and Maintenance budget item an Essential Support priority and that the Governor and the Legislature be notified of the same.

Adopted:

December 7, 1998

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

**POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION NEEDS OF
OKANOGAN AND JEFFERSON COUNTIES**

Final Report

Submitted By.

**MGT of America, Inc.
1607 Cooper Point Rd. NW
Olympia, WA 98502**

September 14, 1998

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The accompanying report was prepared in response to the request of the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) for an assessment of the postsecondary education needs of residents in Jefferson and Okanogan Counties. The Board had been asked by the 1997 Legislature to examine the issue. The HECB specified that "instructional technology and organizational-governance alternatives" be addressed in the study. It also requested that the research team work closely with community leaders, area employers, and residents in the two counties in determining needs and in "evaluating the feasibility and support for the use of a wide variety of program delivery alternatives."

This report profiles the two counties and provides insights into the needs and desires of the residents for means and methods to improve their opportunities for advancement and for an improved economic base. While each has its unique characteristics, the two counties (one on the Olympic Peninsula and the other in North Central Washington) manifest economic and social conditions affecting many of Washington's lesser populated rural areas. Therefore, they offer an opportunity to consider some of the postsecondary education needs of rural counties generally and to devise cost-effective ways to address them. At the same time, it should be clearly understood that the essential differences between the two areas require individual strategies to best meet identified needs.

Both Jefferson and Okanogan Counties are strong candidates for economic growth and development. Both display similar characteristics as well as some important differences. Both, for example, contain vital regional service centers. Both have important small cities. In both cases new employment sectors are displacing older ones. Both are located in relatively close proximity to Canada, and to the populations, visitors, markets, and industries of British Columbia. Both counties also comprise substantial rural areas. In both areas much of the outback is uninhabited, and is owned by the federal government or Indian nations. Both are

MGT of America, Inc.

displaying population growth. Jefferson County is the second fastest growing county in the state, according to recent official statistics while Okanogan is growing at a somewhat slower rate. This may be due, in part at least, to Jefferson County's closer proximity to the fast growing Puget Sound corridor.

With respect to enrollments in higher education, both counties are below statewide average participation rates. In Jefferson County the 1996 community college participation rate was 2.53 percent (enrollments as a percentage of over age-17 population), well below the statewide average of 4.06 percent. In that year, the community college participation rate in Okanogan County was 2.65 percent. The participation rate for Jefferson County residents in upper-division programs throughout the state was .57 percent, also well below the state average of .95 percent. In Okanogan County the rate was .75 percent. The HECB goal for upper-division enrollments ("70th percentile goal") equates to a participation rate of 1.45 percent. As discussed in the full report, the additional numbers of students associated with achieving the higher participation rates, even by the year 2020, are not great by urban county criteria, but they represent important deficits by Jefferson and Okanogan County standards. When taken together, the participation deficits in rural counties represent a substantial challenge to the State of Washington since per capita participation is below the state coverage in rural counties without four-year institutions.

In addition to data on higher education participation, the full report contains information on the socioeconomic characteristics of each of the two counties and the results of the multifaceted field based qualitative analysis. The findings emanating from these analyses, that serve as the basis for what is presented as a vision of expanded postsecondary education services for rural areas in general and the two counties in particular, are summarized as follows:

- Most population growth is in the older and younger age groups, and this is contributing both to an increase in the average age of the population and,

MGT of America, Inc.

unless ways are found to retain larger numbers of out migrating younger adults, to possible future labor shortages

- There are continuing changes in economic emphases from rural-based extraction to service and tourism industries
- There is a slow but steady employment growth, although both counties are classified as "distressed areas"
- Our field studies indicate that the greatest needs are for
 - a coordinated approach among providers of postsecondary service;
 - vocational and continuing education programs plus selected four-year degree opportunities;
 - improved affordability of higher education; and
 - student support services, including financial aid, counseling, etc.
- The economics of higher education also dictate that there be extensive and effective use of electronic technologies and distance education in meeting local needs.

The elements that should be involved in providing expanded postsecondary education services to rural areas in general and the specific recommendations relating to Okanogan and Jefferson Counties have been developed by the study team based on the quantitative and qualitative analyses and after extensive consultation with the Project Coordination Team (PCT) and Community Advisory Groups (CAGS) for each county. The specific recommendations are outlined below. They repeat the recommendations contained in Chapter 4 of the report.

1. **Recommendations Related To Access**

- A. **Need for Expanded Educational Services:** The assessment indicates that there is a need to expand postsecondary education services to the two counties and that developments in technology, coupled with continuing state attention and the active involvement of the communities will make it possible to achieve the state's participation objectives. This need is demonstrated by the economic, demographic and social factors affecting the counties as well as by the relatively low rate of participation in higher education programs. Achievement of the statewide community college participation average and the fiftieth percentile rate at the upper division level is a reasonable goal for the year 2010.
- B. **Use of Local Resources:** The response to area needs should make maximum use of local resources, particularly K-12 facilities, to extend services to lesspopulated areas within the region and reduce the need to commute long distances. Local resources can play a critical role in both the provision of vocational-technical programs and in supporting effective use of distance education technology.
- C. **The Need for** a "Center": The field review findings indicate a need for a "center", a physical presence through which information and service delivery can be coordinated. This concept does not imply a large scale comprehensive facility; rather, the most likely need is for a modest building or location or, (as in Omak), additions to existing facilities. The "center" would provide the focal point for support services, information on the classes and activities of a variety of providers and the use of distance education technologies. In addition, instructional services could be provided both in the center and in other locations as indicated by local needs.
- D. **The Need for information and Support Services:** Although local providers now expend considerable energy attempting to provide information and make opportunities clear, the substantial feedback from focus groups and community meeting participants about barriers to access and the need for more information and support services suggests that efforts in the areas of public information, financial aid, counseling and advising can be expanded. These steps, combined with selected state initiatives to extend financial aid for part-time students and older, placebound individuals in rural counties, could do much to make programs more available to rural area residents.
- E. **The Need for Targeted Financial Assistance:** The review indicates that affordability is one of the major barriers to access. While most main stream financial aid programs are available to those who wish to enroll full-time, financial aid is a problem for those who wish to stay home and pursue a parttime program. *It is recommended that the HECB evaluation propose a program of financial assistance to needy residents of designated rural areas to provide support for the*

costs of *part-time enrollment in extended programs and distance learning activities*. This program could be pilot tested in Okanogan and Jefferson Counties in conjunction with the service delivery recommendations offered below. This program should focus on part-time students and provide need based grants limited to tuition and fees, books and supplies, transportation costs and, as needed, childcare. In addition, *it is recommended that the HECB consider proposing that the Legislature amend the eligibility for the Education Opportunity Grant program to extend it to rural counties where participation in upper division education is below the statewide average. It is also recommended that the Board consider a parallel 'Vocational Opportunity Grant' program for residents of under served rural areas so they can access specialized training programs in other parts of the state.*

- F. **Occupational Pro-grams:** There is a need for improved access to expanded education levels and economic status through more occupationally related programs, both two-year and four-year. At the same time, there is a lack of critical mass to justify specialized facilities. To meet the changing needs for vocational programs, a number of approaches are possible. For example, programs can employ a reverse version of the approach now used in the Running Start program, with local school districts making specialized space available for higher education programs, with the higher education institutions providing some added support to upgrade and modernize equipment where needed. Mobile units, now used by a number of community colleges, are also an option. These approaches could offer a "Win-win" solution to meeting occupational needs at both the secondary and postsecondary levels. For those individuals whose technical training needs are too equipment intensive to provide in the area, the use of the proposed Vocational Opportunity Grant is suggested.
- G. **Distance Education and the Problems of Distance:** Distance education technology must play an active role in meeting rural area postsecondary education needs. In addition to individually focused asynchronous experiences, electronically linked classes in scattered locations using local talent-as "learning aides or coaches" are envisioned. Consideration should also be given to other innovative ways of making access available, including outfitting existing space in donated facilities, mobile units that might be placed in different locales, and joint ventures with communities *In extending telecommunications services, the state's efforts should emphasize rural under-served areas and include pursuit of special telephone rates for interactive distance learning.* In addition to addressing commuting problems through distance access, consideration should be given to strategies to reduce the costs and mitigate other problems (e.g., safety) related to commuting in the evenings and in bad weather. Steps could include the cooperative use of school bus fleets, cooperation with county transit (where available) for evening schedules, and transportation subsidies for needy enrollees.

2. **Recommendations Related to Provision of Services**

A. **The Partnering Approach:** Variety in programming and improved program/ service coordination would be gained through a partnering approach. The precise nature of the Partnership and its components will vary with the region but would have the following general characteristics

- It would contain provider institutions, offering accredited programs to residents of the area, as well as a wide range of parties interested in and concerned with obtaining postsecondary education services.
- It would be organic in nature and not be a separate governmental entity. Public institutions and agencies would play roles, such as initiating action and serving as a fiscal agent, but the Partnership would have no statutory status.
- As a general rule, the institution with the closest ties to the area should serve as the "initiator" of action. In most cases, it will be the community college in whose district the county lies. The initiating institution (and the SBCTC if it is a community college) should work with the HECB in identifying other institutions interested in active participation as provider institutions. This would include institutions then offering services to the area as well as others interested in so doing.
- The area community college would have responsibility for lower division work, vocational and remedial programs, although other community colleges could be involved in specialty areas. Any of the participating institutions could provide community economic development oriented short courses and workshops or non-credit offerings of interest. Participating four-year institutions (public and private) would provide upper division, graduate programs, and other needed services unique to their missions, as needed.
- While Partnership member institutions would be looked to first to offer programs, the Partnership and/or the HECB would have authority to bring in other programs if the member institutions declined or lacked pertinent resources.
- The Partnership is envisioned as an inclusive entity that would work with the HECB on a continuing basis to identify needs and develop strategies to, meet those needs. It would include the institutions interested in active participation as providers of service as well as members of the community. The HECB can play an important role in identifying those individuals, much as it has in establishing the Community Advisory Groups for this project. Groups whose participation in the Partnership is important include the following:

MGT of American, Inc.

- Native American tribes
- Economic Development Councils
- K-12 school districts
- Workforce training and placement agencies (ESD, PiCs, etc.)
- Local officials
- Interested citizens
- Non-profit organizations concerned with and/or providing adult education including such entities as Jefferson County Higher Education Access Committee
- Local media
- Business and labor representatives
- Program participants (consumers) from the community

B. Needs Assessment and Response: This study has indicated specific needs in a number of program areas, including health professions, teacher education and upgrading, computer technologies and other occupational fields. However, it is clear that needs change rapidly. Therefore, needs assessment should be an ongoing responsibility of the higher education center, in cooperation with the HECB. ***The HECB should consider assuming an active role in identifying program needs and not limit itself to the review and approval of institutional program proposals.*** The response to needs should be built in an exploratory manner, encouraging experimentation in course offerings. The field review suggests a strong program focus emphasizing career opportunities. The question of critical mass for efficient course enrollment levels and the extent to which distance technologies can overcome dispersed participation needs to be explored on a case-by-case basis.

3. Recommendations Related To Financing

A. Targeted Funding for Support Services: The flow of funding is particularly important. A fiscal agent for the Partnership is necessary. The fiscal agent should be a recognized entity of the state of Washington empowered to receive and expend appropriations and be the designated entity for coordinating provision of information and support services. ***Specific funding for these functions, along with administrative and facility operations costs, should be appropriated, as a line item, to the Fiscal agent and kept separate from the funding for course enrollments which would flow to the providing institutions.*** In addition to being earmarked, the funding for key student services should not be based on on-campus FTE oriented formulas but be based on an analysis of specific local needs.

B. Funding of Instructional Services: Ongoing funding of instructional services should be through the provider institutions. However, the issue of which courses and experiences should be eligible for state support deserves attention in addressing provision of postsecondary services to rural areas. The number of full-time equivalent (FTE) students served is the budget factor used most commonly to measure need for state appropriations. In most cases, short courses and non-degree offerings are not

eligible for being counted towards an FTE. However, many courses needed in rural areas to support local economic development or to provide basic **skills**, e.g., how to access the Internet, do not require a full term nor carry degree credit. In areas where full service institutions exist, these offerings can be provided using institutional facilities and at relatively marginal cost investments. This is not so in rural areas where these service bases do not exist. ***Consideration should be given to a separate definition of which educational experiences are eligible for state support in conjunction with rural area service delivery.*** This should include offerings related to economic development, upgrading of skills to participate in higher education programs, and how to use computers and gain access to and use the Internet.

- C. **Coordination with other State Agencies:** Passage by Congress of the 'Workforce Investment Act offers the potential to assist rural areas in meeting some of their postsecondary needs for workforce training. The new legislation simplifies several programs and stresses the "career oriented" concept, consistent with the recommendations of this study for a well-defined center. It is extremely important that all of the state agencies concerned with local area education and training needs work closely together to assure the most effective use of available resources and avoid duplication of services. ***The HECB should initiate discussions with the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board toward achieving these objectives.***

4. **Recommendations Related to Jefferson and Okanogan Counties:** The following recommendations are relevant to Okanogan and Jefferson counties individually.

- A. The development of the Partnerships in each of the two counties should build on the participation to date in the Program Coordination Team and the community advisory groups for this project. As noted above, the HECB should play a continuing role in development of the Partnerships.
- B. As these Partnerships unfold, the HECB should ensure that they are included in statewide developments to extend access to increased education services. ***The partnerships should be used to pilot test targeted Financial aid for part-time rural students and residents should be eligible for Education Opportunity Grants and the proposed Vocational Opportunity Grants. Their "center" should be included in K-20 planning, and steps should be taken to see that access to distance education becomes a reality.*** This suggests that the next stage in their development is the preparation of detailed, time specific plans for implementation of these recommendations and initiating the steps necessary for them to become a reality.
- C. The geographic and topographic features of both counties support the need for a distributive approach to service delivery, emanating from or channeled through the central source and accessible at selected locations, e.g., Quilcene, Oroville, etc., through use of community and K-12 facilities. Along this line, it is clear that the Coulee Dam area of Okanogan County is best served through the center operated by

Big Bend Community College and the Bridgeport area of Douglas County by the North Campus of WVCC. The western section of Jefferson County is geographically isolated from the more populated eastern portion, although Peninsula College serves the area from a center in Forks. Some of its needs could be served by both Peninsula and Grays Harbor Community Colleges.

- D. Regarding facilities, in Okanogan County, *the immediate need is the addition of a science laboratory and a distance teaming classroom to the existing facility.* Additional off-site parking may also be needed. Space utilization patterns indicate heavy use from Monday through Thursday. An opportunity exists for intense Friday afternoon and Saturday programs to augment existing course offerings including offering upper division opportunities. The expanded facility should be known as the Okanogan Higher Education Center.
- E. In Jefferson County, the facilities issues are somewhat more complex. The two sites (Peninsula and WSU) have existing leases. *It is recommended that there should be one facility operated by the Partnership that would be the center for operations and information.* This could be accomplished by the development of a new facility or the designation of one of the existing locations as the "center", i.e., the Jefferson County Higher Education Center, and the other used for instructional purposes. The identity of the center, and any separate locations, both in the near and longer terms, should reflect that of the Partnership rather than that of any individual institutional member.

5. Recommendations for Implementation:

The following recommendations are offered as a guide to the HECB in implementation of the above recommendations should it choose to adopt them.

- A. The Board transmits the report and recommendations to the Legislature with a request that funding be provided to the Board (for subsequent allocation to the designated fiscal agents) for establishment of the Partnerships. It is estimated that \$100,000 per year per partnership is necessary, along with an amount for initial program development (\$50,000 each). The Board should also endorse the recommended facility expansion in Okanogan County.
- B. The Board should propose an amendment of the State Education Opportunity Grant to extend eligibility to residents of rural counties where participation in upper division education is below the statewide average. In addition, the Board staff should develop the specific components of the targeted Rural Area Program and the Vocational Opportunity Grant and prepare specific proposals for legislative consideration in 2000. If the development effort requires added funding, it is recommended that the Board seek the necessary amount.
- C. The Board should assure an ongoing continuing role in involvement with rural area partnerships including an assessment of the status of cooperative service delivery in

rural areas other than Jefferson and Okanogan counties. The Board should be in a position to ascertain and report the degree of service availability relative to approximate need in these areas. The Board should seek funding (estimated at \$150,000) for this activity.

- D. The Board staff should work with the Office of Financial Management, legislative staff and representatives of the two- and four-year institutions concerning the definition of courses eligible for funding in rural area partnerships.

MGT of America, Inc.

RESOLUTION NO. 98-48

WHEREAS, In 1997 the Legislature directed the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) to undertake an evaluation of the postsecondary education needs and program delivery alternatives for Okanogan and Jefferson Counties; and

WHEREAS, Staff of the HECB, in consultation with community advisory groups and representatives of the public four- and two-year institutions, developed a study work plan which included: the development of an inventory of current postsecondary education programs in the study areas, an analysis of area demographic trends, labor market trends, and regional economic development plans and policies, the assessment of postsecondary program planning needs for the study areas, and the identification and evaluation of alternative program delivery methods and organizational models; and

WHEREAS, The HECB retained MGT of America, Inc., to carry out the aforementioned study work plan and to provide independent recommendations concerning appropriate means of meeting area postsecondary education needs; and

WHEREAS, MGT of America, Inc., the project consultant, submitted on September 14, 1998, its final report entitled Postsecondary Education Needs of Okanogan and Jefferson Counties; and

WHEREAS, Staff of the HECB held numerous public meetings in Jefferson and Okanogan Counties to elicit input from the public on the final report and recommendations; and

WHEREAS, The project consultant has recommended, in part, that the HECB seek Legislative approval to initiate a pilot demonstration program in Okanogan and Jefferson Counties to provide a coordinated higher education information and referral resource to area residents; and

WHEREAS, The Governor and Legislature are now developing proposals for the 1999-2001 operating and capital budgets;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board supports the initiation of the aforementioned pilot demonstration project and seeks Legislative authorization to undertake this project.

Adopted:

December 7, 1998

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

SPOKANE-AREA HIGHER EDUCATION SERVICES STUDY SUBSTITUTE SENATE BILL 6655

December 1998

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

Substitute Senate Bill 6655 directs the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB), Eastern Washington University (EWU), and Washington State University (WSU) to examine fully how the state can best use its public investment in higher education in eastern Washington and the Spokane area and continue to provide the highest quality education for students. This legislation directs responsibilities to the HECB, EWU, and WSU for refocusing public higher education in the greater Spokane area.

The HECB completed its preliminary higher education and economic assessments in September. The disposition of the Spokane Center is yet to be determined. Final reports from EWU and WSU on the plans for redefining and refocusing their missions and operations were delivered to the HECB in October for Board review, evaluation, and approval.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **Conditional approval is recommended for both WSU and EWU plans**, pending the April 1, 1999, completion of the EWU comprehensive program review of its Spokane program offerings.
2. **Conditional approval is recommended for Eastern Washington University's Mission and Operating Plan** submitted October 15, 1998. The approval is conditioned upon EWU's completion of a review of its Spokane program offerings by April 1, 1999.
3. **Conditional approval is recommended for Washington State University's Planning for Higher Education in Spokane** submitted October 15, 1998. The due date for a final plan will be June 1, 1999. The final plan should include:
 - a) a Riverpoint-specific mission statement that emphasizes the provision of graduate and research programs and reflects WSU Spokane's aspirations to become a destination campus for various areas of study;
 - b) program delivery plans that include predominantly on-site instruction;
 - c) re-evaluation of the proposed Executive Development Center;
 - d) continued development of the Health Sciences Consortium's organization and operating guidelines for implementation of core services and multi-institutional programs of study.

Furthermore, it is recommended that by June 1, 1999, WSU, in collaboration with the other higher education institutions in the Spokane area, complete a market analysis/education needs assessment, to determine how WSU Spokane can help meet the demand for higher education statewide, as well as in the immediate Spokane area. Furthermore, by June 1, 1999, it is also recommended that WSU submit a final management plan for the Riverpoint campus that incorporates relevant findings from the additional assessments (described above), and final information about EWU Spokane programs. Finally, it is recommended that WSU submit full proposals for those degree programs proposed in its plan for HECB consideration.

4. HECB will submit a plan for the disposition of the Spokane Center on June 1, 1999, allowing consideration of the findings of EWU's report of April 1, 1999. The plan will be based upon an evaluation of fiscal capacity at state higher education facilities in Cheney and Spokane.

**SPOKANE-AREA HIGHER EDUCATION SERVICES
SUBSTITUTE SENATE BILL 6655**

December 1998

BACKGROUND

Governor Gary Locke directed the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) to examine fully how the state can best use its public investment in higher education in eastern Washington and the Spokane area and continue to provide the highest quality education for students. The Board met in the Spokane area in January and February 1998, and reported back to Governor Locke on February 15, 1998, with preliminary findings and recommendations. Substitute Senate Bill 6655 was enacted in the 1998 Legislative Session, and signed by Governor Locke on April 3, 1998.

This legislation directs responsibilities to the Higher Education Coordinating Board, Eastern Washington University (EWU) and Washington State University (WSU) for refocusing public higher education in the greater Spokane area. Specifically, SSB6655 directed that:

- **the Spokane branch campus of Washington State University** be located at the Riverpoint Higher Education Park, and that WSU be the fiscal agent of the Riverpoint Park.
- **Eastern Washington University** may serve students at the Riverpoint Park, but the bill states that the residential mission of EWU in Cheney should be strengthened, with a focus on the excellence of its primary Cheney campus.
- The **Higher Education Coordinating Board** shall manage an assessment that determines the current higher education resources of the greater Spokane area and the current and future capital and programmatic higher education needs of the Spokane area, including the balance among anticipated, unmet, and fully met higher education needs. This assessment shall be coordinated with an economic analysis of the greater Spokane area.

The HECB completed its preliminary higher education and economic assessments in September. Findings of those reports are summarized later in this report. Final reports from WSU and EWU on the plans for redefining and refocusing their missions and operations were delivered to the Higher Education Coordinating Board on October 15, 1998, for review and approval.

The following report reviews preliminary assessments of higher education services and needs in the Spokane area, reviews the specific plans submitted by the two institutions, and provides future

direction for continued development in the Spokane area. Recommendations are presented in four areas:

Part I: Recommendations for EWU

Part II: Recommendations for WSU

Part III: Recommendations for WSU Management Plan

Part IV: Recommendations on the Disposition of the Spokane Center

WSU and EWU are commended for their work in developing their plans. Both institutions completed a substantial amount of work in a relatively short time. While significant additional tasks remain, the two universities have made impressive progress this year.

Summary Recommendation. Conditional approval is recommended for both WSU and EWU plans, pending the April 1, 1999, completion of the EWU comprehensive program review. This date will allow for continued refinement to both institutions' plans, and for an analysis of future needs in the Spokane area that relate to regional and statewide interests.

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

Higher Education Services Currently Available in Spokane:

At the September 1998, meeting of the Higher Education Coordinating Board, an inventory / summary was presented of enrollment and degrees granted at WSU Spokane, EWU, the community colleges (Spokane Community College and Spokane Falls Community College), and several independent institutions (Whitworth College and Gonzaga University).

The inventory shows that 30,000 people are enrolled at the various institutions of higher education in Spokane County. Most are enrolled at the undergraduate level; about half of the enrollment occurs at the two community colleges (Spokane and Spokane Falls). In terms of degrees granted, about 4,000 bachelors and masters degrees are awarded by the four-year institutions. EWU awards half of the degrees; Whitworth and Gonzaga account for about one-quarter of degrees granted each year. Community colleges confer about 1,800 associate degrees, plus additional certificates. In order to determine the types of programs available in Spokane, enrollment and degree data were analyzed by 12 major categories or fields of study. It is noteworthy that nearly all fields showed significant numbers of students enrolled, as well as degrees awarded in all fields. (Source: *Higher Education Needs Assessment, HECB, September 25, 1998.*)

One gauge of higher education availability is the participation rate of residents from a particular area. Spokane County has a relatively high proportion of its citizens who are enrolled in higher education. For example, among the 39 counties, Spokane ranks seventh in participation at public four-year institutions in the state. Although this figure includes attendance at any institution (UW, CWU, etc.), reports from both Washington State and Eastern indicate that a large proportion of their enrollment is made up of residents within the Spokane area. (Source: *OFM, Higher Education Enrollment Statistics and Projections 1997-99 Biennium, February 1997.*)

Public Opinion Survey of Higher Education in the Spokane Area:

HECB's analysis also involved a sample survey of Spokane area residents' perceptions of the availability of higher education in Spokane, as well as any plans they might have to enroll in a college or university. Most respondents to the survey (97 percent) rated the quality of higher education as high. Eleven (11) percent were currently enrolled, while another 64 percent reported that someone in their household was likely to enroll in the next five years. When asked about potential fields of study, business, education and health accounted for half of the responses. (Source: "*Higher Education Needs Assessment*," HECB, September 25, 1998.)

Economic Assessment:

A third aspect of HECB's Spokane study involved an economic analysis of the area. The report notes that in the Spokane area, 33 to 45 percent of new workers will need at least some college education, and continuing education will be required to stay current or change occupations. The report notes that "more emphasis on higher education is likely to be required to support the staffing needs of firms operating in the Spokane area. Either local higher education services will need to expand, or firms will increasingly find it necessary to recruit from other regions." Two fields were identified as major growth areas: health care and high tech manufacturing. (Source: "*The Future of the Spokane Economy: Implications for Higher Education*," Northwest Policy Center, September 25, 1998.)

A comparison of the economic assessment with the inventory of current higher education services is instructive. Although residents of the Spokane area already enroll in higher education at a rate exceeding many other parts of the state, *the question for Spokane is, what programs could be offered at Riverpoint, that are not already being offered in the greater Spokane area, that would help the state meet its objective of serving growing demand for higher education, particularly at the upper-division and graduate levels?*

The economic assessment, for example, asserts that more health care training is needed. Although the health field is well represented in programs currently offered in Spokane, the assessment appears to corroborate proposals for a health sciences consortium, which would consolidate existing educational opportunities, and expand into additional specializations. This kind of collaborative arrangement could better utilize the state's considerable investment in Spokane (including the proposed Health Sciences Building) and provide skill training for emerging market requirements.

The discussion in the following sections refers to the plans submitted by EWU and WSU on October 15, 1998.

PART I: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EASTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Overview of EWU Plan:

As directed by SSB 6655, Eastern Washington University submitted a mission statement and operations plan on October 15, 1998. The plan includes the following:

- A mission statement is promulgated with the principles for a "comprehensive, Cheney-based public institution of higher education," as noted in the legislation (SSB 6655).

- The university will “go beyond the specific requirements of the legislation to begin a re-examination of the overall direction and operations of the institution.....the process will lead to examination of the organization structure of the university and a full review of its academic programming.”
- The primary student audience is identified:
 - 75 percent from eastern Washington;
 - 50 percent live in Spokane; 33 percent live in Cheney.
 - 19 percent are from western Washington or out of state.
 - Many are transfers;
 - 60 percent are traditional college age;
 - Many receive financial aid.
- Admission standards are reviewed and deemed appropriate.
- Enrollment projections are targeted toward steady increases in the next five years; strategies to achieve goals are reviewed.
- Instructional capacity will be utilized more at both Cheney and Spokane locations.
- Finances: Eastern seeks an extension of the enrollment-funding proviso through the next biennium.
- Location: EWU commits to a range of programs and services on the Cheney campus.
- Spokane programs will include physical therapy, communication disorders, dental hygiene, nursing, and occupational therapy (pending HECB approval).
- Spokane programming: EWU proposes to review its current Spokane programming by April 1, 1999, and report at that time to HECB.
- The business program on the Cheney campus will be strengthened.
- Realizing the mission: EWU will
 - **Complete an academic program review of all programs by April 1, 1999.**
 - **Reorganize administrative structure; develop new budgeting; continue regional and statewide recruiting; develop links with area organizations; and develop distance education and off-campus programming.**

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EWU:

Conditional approval is recommended for Eastern Washington University's Mission and Operating Plan"submitted October 15, 1998. The approval is conditional upon EWU's completion of a review of all academic programs by April 1, 1999. This review, originally due October 15, 1998, is intended to determine what programs currently located in Spokane "...should be returned to the Cheney campus, discontinued, or continued to be offered in Spokane because of documented demand, unique partnerships, demonstrated efficiency, and other considerations" (SSB 6655). EWU has requested an extension of that due date in order to complete a more comprehensive review of programs and courses in Spokane as well as Cheney.

Until EWU completes this program review, it is not possible to determine the appropriate disposition of the Spokane Center building, or the appropriate number, disciplines, and distribution of Riverpoint course offerings.

Most elements of the EWU plan are acceptable as presented. The mission statement focuses on the comprehensive nature of the Cheney-based university. Since the intent of the legislation and the HECB guidelines is to focus EWU's role as a comprehensive institution based in Cheney, EWU is to be commended for proposing to engage in a process of reviewing and analyzing its program offerings.

The additional effort and time needed to complete the review will help to fulfill part of HECB's guidelines for the review and restructuring of higher education services in the greater Spokane area: specifically that EWU ensure that "every effort is made to protect the academic interests of, and minimize adverse impacts on Eastern Washington University students."

For the final report of April 1, 1999, HECB understands that a review will be completed of all programs offered by EWU at the main campus and at locations in Spokane. The following elements related to **instruction** should be included as part of the plan:

- An analysis of Spokane-based program offerings that will be returned to Cheney, discontinued, or continued to be offered in Spokane because of documented demand, unique partnerships, and demonstrated efficiency;
- An overview of contemplated degree programs at Eastern Washington University in future years, both at the main campus and in Spokane; and
- A discussion of centers of excellence proposed for the EWU main campus.

PART II: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

Overview of WSU Plan:

As directed by SSB 6655, Washington State University submitted a mission statement and operations plan on October 15, 1998. The plan includes the following:

- The economic and cultural context of the Spokane area.
- The rationale for partnerships, such as the Health Sciences Consortium.
- An abbreviated mission statement with core areas of focus, as follows:
 - Health Sciences
 - Interdisciplinary Design Institute
 - Engineering and Technology
 - Business
 - Education
 - Agriculture
 - Academic support including Honors College, Library, Information Technology, and Outreach
 - Research Collaboration with SIRT
 - International Programs
- Plan for relocation of all programs to Riverpoint.
- An organizational and governance plan, plus overall financial requirements, for the Health Sciences Consortium.
- Discussions of :
 - Continuation of EWU programs in Spokane

- Primary and non-primary student audience
- Admissions standards
- Projected enrollment levels and concomitant financial requirements
- Capital and capacity considerations.

HECB RECOMMENDATIONS FOR WSU:

Conditional approval is recommended for Washington State University's Planning for Higher Education in Spokane submitted October 15, 1998. The due date for a final plan will be June 1, 1999. Furthermore, it is recommended that WSU submit full proposals for those programs proposed in its plan for HECB consideration.

There are many positive aspects of the plan, and it is generally acceptable. Furthermore, the initial steps taken toward collaboration with other institutions and with community groups appear to be positive. However, HECB finds that the following areas merit additional attention.

FURTHER MARKET ANALYSIS / EDUCATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT

- *Specific employment / training needs in the Spokane area, possibly combined with an examination of specific areas of interest for current and future students.* This work would build on the initial assessment by HECB of economic trends and the current availability of higher education services in the Spokane area; and
- *An analysis of education needs that would identify courses and programs to serve a broader student market than that which exists in the greater Spokane area.* WSU has identified its vision for WSU Spokane as a destination or "magnet" for education services in a larger market.

Specifically, WSU is requested to conduct additional analyses that would result in an overall prospectus of how WSU Spokane can help meet the demand for higher education statewide, as well as in the immediate Spokane area. The analysis should include the following components:

- 1) **Spokane-area employer survey** of employees' education and training needs;
- 2) **Spokane-area survey of potential students' course and program interests;** and
- 3) **Identification of emerging or unmet needs for education and training in Washington state,** which is not duplicative of EWU undergraduate programs and which, if accommodated at Riverpoint, would attract students from across the state. This assessment should include analysis of existing research (e.g. *NSIS I Needs Assessment; Postsecondary Education Needs of Okanogan and Jefferson Counties*), as well as new research and assessments.

HECB proposal to fund further needs analyses: To aid in analyzing future education and training needs, HECB will provide funding to WSU to conduct additional research. To access funds, WSU should submit a short proposal developed in cooperation with the other Spokane-area higher education institutions, outlining an assessment process, and overview of the anticipated product, and an estimated dollar amount required to complete the work. Upon approval of the proposal, HECB would transmit funds to WSU. The due date for a final report to HECB would be June 1, 1999.

HECB anticipates the following would be the types of factors, activities, and analyses to be included in the proposal:

- **Collaboration with other public and independent higher education** institutions in the Spokane area, and with **community and business enterprises in the Spokane area**. HECB notes the recent establishment of a “Higher Education Leadership Group” under the auspices of the Spokane Area Chamber of Commerce. This Group appears to be a promising vehicle for promoting coordination and partnerships among business, community and higher education endeavors. Among its goals is the evaluation of economic opportunities and educational programs – which is congruent with the type of proposal described here.
- **Original research activities** such as surveys of employers / businesses / industries / service providers in the Spokane area; surveys of potential students – particularly those intending to pursue higher education in the future. This may involve not only the Spokane area, but possibly a larger portion of the state’s population.
- **Independent researcher**. HECB recommends that an outside consultant or group be chosen to conduct the study. Specifically, a researcher should be chosen who is not affiliated with an institution of higher education located in the Spokane area.

Additionally, because EWU has asked for an extension of its program review until April 1, 1999, EWU’s work will coincide with the analyses proposed here. Therefore, WSU is encouraged to work closely with EWU during the next few months, communicating to EWU any preliminary results that could assist EWU in its planning. Further, WSU should consider the April 1, 1999, results of EWU’s program review when WSU’s final report is assembled.

The final report should reiterate those programs already proposed for WSU Spokane and identify what new programs, if any, are needed, and what programs/coursework could be redirected. The report should discuss the collaborative and specialized functions envisioned for the various higher education entities in Spokane, and explore WSU Spokane’s potential contributions toward the needs of the state / region in connection with its mission of becoming a destination campus.

Finally, based on the findings of this “market research,” the report should include a proposal for site-based centers of excellence at WSU Spokane.

REFINEMENT OF MISSION STATEMENT

- **Riverpoint-specific Mission Statement.**

The mission statement for WSU Spokane should be revised to reflect more specifically the unique mission of the campus, which will become the primary provider of graduate and research programs, along with its continued role in providing upper-division coursework for selected degree programs. Furthermore, WSU Spokane’s mission statement should reflect its aspirations to become a destination, or “magnet,” for various areas of study / excellence.

- **Make on-site Instruction a Clear Priority.**

As WSU continues to review plans for Spokane, HECB requests further analysis of plans with the goal of maximizing site-based programs as the major delivery mode. To date, several WSU programs offered or proposed for Spokane would rely on distance-education delivery to a large extent. These programs include Engineering, a Master of Technology Management, and a BA in

Agriculture. WSU's proposed BS in Computer Engineering, BA in Business Administration/Real Estate, BA in Business Administration/Risk Management, and BA in Hotel and Restaurant Administration also would rely on distance-education delivery, though to a lesser extent.

However, based on the text of SSB 6655, and ongoing dialogue among the Legislature, the HECB, and the community of Spokane, the intent is for site-based instruction to characterize higher education services at the Riverpoint Higher Education Park. Therefore, HECB recommends that program delivery plans for WSU Spokane include predominately on-site instruction.

- **Executive Development Center**

HECB requests re-examination of whether the proposed "executive development center" and the intention to offer certificate programs in international business are consistent with the graduate and research focus of WSU Spokane. WSU should also reconsider whether other institutions are already positioned to offer or in fact do offer certificate programs in international business already.

- **Health Sciences Consortium**

WSU's initial discussion of the consortium, in the plan of October 15, 1998, envisions a highly collaborative enterprise, as evidenced by the organization chart and the discussion of health science activities currently underway at the various institutions. As of that date, two meetings had been held with all participants in the Consortium and numerous meetings have been held with sub-groups of the Consortium. In the final plan, HECB requests more elaboration of the consortium's organization and operating guidelines for implementation of core services and multi-institutional programs of study.

PART III: WSU MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE RIVERPOINT HIGHER EDUCATION PARK:

SSB 6655 requires that a management plan for Riverpoint be submitted by December 1, 1998. This plan should be based, at least in part, on a completed needs assessment of the Spokane area.

HECB Recommendations for WSU Management Plan:

- Preliminary approval of the WSU management plan, submitted December 1, 1998.
- A final WSU Management Plan, due June 1, 1999, which will incorporate relevant findings from additional higher education needs assessments (described above), and information about EWU Spokane programs, which should be reflected in Eastern's April 1, 1999, program review report.

PART IV: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE DISPOSITION OF THE SPOKANE CENTER

SSB 6655 directs the HECB to develop a plan for disposition of the Spokane Center by December 1, 1998. However two factors support setting a later report due date.

First, it is not possible to know the extent to which space in the Spokane Center will be needed until EWU has completed an analysis of which programs will be retained in Spokane. While SSB

6655 directed that such a review be completed by October 15, 1998, EWU has requested that date be extended until April 1, 1999, in order to allow a more thorough examination of courses/programs offered both in Spokane and Cheney. Second, a thorough analysis of space and functional requirements of EWU program offerings is needed prior to making a determination about the disposition of the Center.

Therefore, HECB will submit a plan for the Disposition of the Spokane Center on June 1, 1999, allowing consideration of the findings of EWU's report of April 1, 1999. The plan will be based upon an evaluation of physical capacity at state higher education facilities in Cheney and Spokane.

In consideration of the EWU program review described above, the WSU program proposals and the additional needs and analyses, HECB shall evaluate opportunities to make maximum use of existing **physical capacity at the Cheney campus and Spokane facilities**. This evaluation should include an analysis of the full capital and operating costs associated with any recommendations to (1) relocate programs to the Cheney campus and (2) continue program offerings in Spokane.

This analysis should include the following components:

1. *A determination of the costs and benefits of consolidating Spokane-based programs at the Riverpoint campus and the consequent appropriate disposition of the Spokane Center Building.*
2. *An assessment of the functional condition of existing facilities at the Cheney campus and the opportunities and associated cost of fully utilizing existing excess capacity. This analysis will be long-term, and involve extensive study by HECB.*

RESOLUTION NO. 98-50

WHEREAS, In 1998 the Legislature directed the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB), Eastern Washington University (EWU), and Washington State University (WSU) to examine fully how the state can best use its public investment in higher education in eastern Washington and the Spokane area and continue to provide the highest quality education for students; and

WHEREAS, The Legislature directed responsibilities to the HECB, EWU, and WSU for refocusing public higher education in the greater Spokane area; and

WHEREAS, The Legislature specifically directed that:

- a) The Spokane branch campus of Washington State University be located at the Riverpoint Higher Education Park, and that WSU be the fiscal agent of the Riverpoint Park;
- b) EWU may serve students at the Riverpoint Park, but the residential mission of EWU in Cheney should be strengthened, with a focus on the excellence of its primary Cheney campus;
- c) The HECB shall manage an assessment that determines the current higher education resources of the greater Spokane area and the current and future capital and programmatic needs of the Spokane area...which shall be coordinated with an economic analysis of the greater Spokane area;
- d) The HECB shall develop a plan for the disposition of the Spokane Center; and

WHEREAS, The HECB completed its preliminary higher education and economic assessments in September; the disposition of the Spokane Center is yet to be determined; and final reports from EWU and WSU on the plans for redefining and refocusing their missions and operations were delivered to the HECB in October for review and approval; and

WHEREAS, WSU and EWU have made impressive progress in developing their plans, and additional tasks remain; and

WHEREAS, The HECB has reviewed the final reports with the aforementioned institutions, and based on said review has prepared recommendations, dated December 7, 1998, for HECB consideration;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board hereby:

1. Conditionally approves both WSU and EWU plans, pending the April 1, 1999 completion of the EWU comprehensive program review of its Spokane program offerings. This date will allow for continued refinement to both institutions' plans, and for an analysis of future needs in the Spokane area that relate to regional and statewide interests.
2. Conditionally approves Eastern Washington University's "Mission and Operating Plan" submitted October 15, 1998. The approval is conditioned upon EWU's completion of a review of its Spokane program offerings by April 1, 1999. This review, originally due October 15, 1998 is intended to determine what programs currently offered in Spokane should be returned to the Cheney campus, discontinued, or continued to be offered in Spokane because of documented demand, unique partnerships, demonstrated efficiency, and other considerations.

3. Conditionally approves Washington State University's "Planning for Higher Education in Spokane" submitted October 15, 1998. The due date for a final plan will be June 1, 1999. The final plan will include:

- e) Riverpoint-specific mission statement that emphasizes the provision of graduate and research programs and reflects WSU Spokane's aspirations to become a destination campus for various areas of study;
- f) program delivery plans that include predominately on-site instruction;
- g) re-evaluation of the proposed Executive Development Center;
- h) continued development of the Health Sciences Consortium's organization and operating guidelines for implementation of core services and multi-institutional programs of study.

Furthermore, by June 1, 1999, WSU, in collaboration with the other higher education institutions in the Spokane area, will complete a further market analysis/education needs assessment. This study would result in an overall prospectus of how WSU Spokane can help meet the demand for higher education statewide, as well as in the immediate Spokane area. HECB will provide funding to WSU to hire a consultant to complete this additional research. Furthermore, by June 1, 1999, WSU will submit a final management plan for the Riverpoint campus that incorporates relevant findings from the additional assessments (described above), and final information about EWU Spokane programs. Finally, WSU will submit full proposals for those degree programs proposed in its plan for HECB consideration.

4. HECB will submit a plan for the disposition of the Spokane Center on June 1, 1999, allowing consideration of the findings of EWU's report of April 1, 1999. The plan will be based upon an evaluation of fiscal capacity at state higher education facilities in Cheney and Spokane.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board commends and expresses its sincere appreciation to the institutions, citizens, and agencies involved in the study, whose cooperation and collaboration in addressing complex issues shows promising approaches for meeting the higher education needs of the immediate Spokane area, as well as the state.

Adopted:

December 7, 1998

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

**GOVERNOR'S 2020 COMMISSION ON HIGHER
EDUCATION RECOMMENDATIONS**

December 1998

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Members of the Governor's 2020 Commission will engage in a panel discussion with the members of the Higher Education Coordinating Board. The dialogue will focus on the report that the 2020 Commission submitted to the Governor regarding their view of higher education in the state of Washington in the year 2020.

Limited copies of the 2020 Commission report, "Learning for Life," will be available during the meeting. This publication is also available electronically on the Governor's homepage:
<http://www.wa.gov/governor>.

RESOLUTION 98-58

WHEREAS, Governor Locke's appointed a 30-member group of business and education leaders to develop a vision for higher education in the year 2020; and

WHEREAS, This 2020 Commission on the Future of Higher Education — co-chaired by HECB chair Bob Craves and retired Weyerhaeuser CEO Jack Creighton — met over ten months to discuss higher education related issues; and

WHEREAS, The Commission reported its vision for higher education to Governor Locke on November 9, 1998; and

WHEREAS, The Commission *concluded* its work just as Higher Education Coordinating Board *began* its statutorily directed work of developing a 2000 Master Plan for higher education; and

WHEREAS, The work of the Commission provides a rich background for higher education research and discussion, and raises many issues and ideas that could hold the key to accommodating new demand for postsecondary education in Washington state;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOVED, That the Washington State Higher Education Coordinating Board commends the 2020 Commission for its work, and pledges to take the next step with the Commission's recommendations by including them in the research and discussion that will shape the 2000 Master Plan.

Adopted:

December 7, 1998

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

COMPETENCY-BASED ADMISSIONS STANDARDS: Aligning Postsecondary Education with K-12 Education Reform

December 1998

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

In 1994, in response to K-12 education reform implemented in House Bill 1209, the Legislature directed the HECB to develop a competency-based admissions system for higher education institutions. The Legislature further directed the Board to complete the design of the system and issue a report outlining the competency-based admissions system by January, 1999.

In 1995, the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) began a process to revise its minimum college admissions standards from traditional measures to competency-based admissions standards. The HECB convened an Admissions Standards Action Committee (ASAC) that included representatives of K-12 education, vocational education, all six public baccalaureate institutions, independent institutions, community colleges, parents, and students to guide the process of developing new standards. ASAC was charged to complete the following tasks:

- **Examine** the standards under which students gain entrance into a public baccalaureate institution;
- **Translate** the current standards in terms of mastery;
- **Identify** how those translated standards will be measured and reported; and
- **Facilitate** a smooth transition to higher education for students.

ASAC divided its work on the competency-based admissions standards project into three phases:

- **Phase one**, which has been completed for English, mathematics, and world languages, designates core-course equivalencies in terms of competencies.
- **Phase two**, which began in 1997, represents the development of a process for assessing and reporting students' achievement.
- **Phase three**, which will begin in 1999, will evaluate the project's components.

ASAC has crafted competency-based admissions standards as a *translation* of the current HECB standards; they are not intended to raise minimum admissions standards. The Commission on Student Learning has established standards for what students should know and be able to do at certain points in their K-12 experience. These standards are called Essential Academic Learning Requirements

(EALRs). The proposed competency-based admissions standards have been created by using and, as necessary, adding to the EALRs.

This report completes a *structure* for a competency-based admissions system to address Washington public high school students who will be graduating from high school with Certificates of Mastery beginning in 2006. Work, however, will continue on the completion of a process that responds to and aligns with the Certificate of Mastery and the Essential Academic Learning Requirements, as directed by the Education Reform Act of 1993 (RCW 28A.630.883), and on evaluation of the project's components.

BOARD ACTION REQUESTED

The Competency-based Admissions Project report to the Legislature is recommended for Board approval.

For a copy of the report to the Legislature, please call the HECB at (360)753-7830.

RESOLUTION NO. 98-53

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board recognizes its responsibilities in helping establish and maintain high standards in education for all students at all grade levels in Washington; and,

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board is required by law to establish *minimum* requirements for admission to Washington's public baccalaureate institutions (RCW 28B.80.350); and,

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board and the State Board of Education were directed (Chapter 149, Section 610, Laws of 1997) to develop a competency-based admissions system for higher education institutions by January 1999 in response to the reforms enacted by the Education Reform Act of 1993; and,

WHEREAS, Competency-based admissions standards have been established, and work on the admissions system will continue as the Certificate of Mastery and assessment of the Essential Academic Learning Requirements evolve; and,

WHEREAS, Work also will continue on evaluation of the project's components;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the December 1998 Competency-based Admissions Report to the Legislature.

Adopted:

December 7, 1998

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

PERFORMANCE FUNDING AND ACCOUNTABILITY: PROGRESS REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

December 1998

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In its 1997-99 biennial budget (ESSB 6108), the Washington Legislature directed the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) to implement an accountability system in consultation with Washington's public four-year universities and college. ESSB 6108 also directed the Board, by January 1999, to recommend to OFM and appropriate legislative committees additions, deletions, or revisions to the performance and accountability measures incorporated into the 1997-99 biennial budget. This report describes the 1997-98 achievements in performance, reviews the first 18 months of implementation, and recommends next steps.

1997-98 Achievements in Performance. Among the 58 separate performance measures reported, institutions met or exceeded 39 (67 percent) of them. This performance earned the institutions \$4,933,438 or 77 percent of the \$6,398,000 in funds held in reserve. Conversely, 23 percent (\$1,464,562) of the funds will not be eligible for release. For the biennium, institutions received 86 percent of the reserve funds, taking into consideration both planning and performance funds.

The First 18 Months. Public accountability for performance to the state and to other external constituents has been widely accepted and practiced, and the focus on specific performance measures has encouraged spirited conversation and creative thinking. Although there is only one year of performance data on which to base judgement, two key issues have emerged from the experience of the first 18 months. First, institutions are committed to striving for continuous improvement in their performance on the three common measures. However, the goals and timetable for reaching them may need to be reassessed in order to produce educational practices that are in the best interests of students. Second, a system that withholds appropriated funds pending achievement at designated performance levels may discourage creativity and innovation. Recommendations for next steps take these two issues into consideration

Recommendations for Next Steps. The accountability initiative is still in its early stages, and much has been learned in these first 18 months. As we move toward a second generation of accountability thinking, it will be critical in the next two years to pose the questions, "How can accountability help to make changes in higher education that are in the best interests of students in this state? What policies are most likely to help us develop a system that will serve all students well?" Based on a review of the first 18 months of the accountability initiative, and taking into consideration the institutions' recommendations for change, the following recommendations are

1. Institutions should continue to make continuous improvement and “meaningful and substantial progress” on all performance measures, and report their progress to the HECB and to the Legislature each year.
2. To encourage progress toward state goals, the Legislature should establish a pool of performance funds. The pool should be funded at not less than \$10 million per biennium. Approximately half of those funds, or 0.5 percent of the institutions’ total budgets, should be held in reserve and awarded on the basis of performance. The other half should be pooled from a variety of sources and made available through a competitive grant process to support institutional initiatives that help to achieve state goals.
 - 2a. Reserve funds from the second year of the 1997-99 biennium should be redirected to this pool, rather than to the Education Savings Account, and used to support student learning outcomes initiatives.
3. In collaboration with Washington’s public baccalaureate institutions, the HECB shall establish distance education performance measures by June 30, 1999. No funding should be tied to these measures for the next biennium, to allow time to define the measures, establish baseline data, and resolve governance issues related to distance education and the K-20 network. The HECB will report to the Legislature in January 2001 on the outcomes of this effort and recommend next steps.

The intent of the measures is to assess the number of students gaining access to education primarily through web-based, interactive video, satellite, or other technologies, and to assess the number of opportunities available. The measures should provide information about the number of students served in courses offered primarily through distance education technology, and the number of courses/programs available. Distinctions between in-state and out-of-state students enrolled in distance education courses, and in-state students taking courses on-site and through distance education should be clarified.

4. Incentive funds should be used to reinforce institutional and state initiatives in the area of student learning outcomes, and to encourage new assessment projects, particularly in the areas of quantitative skills and technological literacy. By 2003, all institutions should have student learning outcomes in place for every undergraduate academic program, aligning those outcomes where appropriate with the K-12 and community college systems. Beginning in December 2000, institutions should report annually to the HECB on progress in establishing and assessing these outcomes. By December 2000, institutions should report to the HECB on the development of the senior writing project.

**PERFORMANCE FUNDING AND ACCOUNTABILITY:
PROGRESS REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE**

December 1998

BACKGROUND

In its 1997-99 biennial budget (ESSB 6108), the Washington Legislature directed the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) to implement an accountability system in consultation with Washington's public four-year universities and college. The Legislature tied resources to completion of institutional plans early in the first fiscal year of the biennium, and, during the second year, to actual performance on five measures outlined in the budget legislation. The Legislature directed the HECB to evaluate each institution's achievement of performance targets for the 1997-98 academic year and to notify the Office of Financial Management (OFM) by November 15, 1998, what portion of the institutions' reserve funds to release.

ESSB 6108 also directs the Board, by January 1999, to recommend to OFM and appropriate legislative committees additions, deletions, or revisions to the performance and accountability measures incorporated into the 1997-99 biennial budget. The measures are to be developed in consultation with the six public baccalaureate institutions of higher education. They *may* include additional performance indicators to measure successful student learning and other student outcomes for possible inclusion in the 1999-01 operating budget. They *shall* include measures of performance demonstrating specific and measurable improvements related to distance education and education provided primarily through technology (*ESSB 6108, Laws of 1998, Chapter 454, Sections 601 - 610*).

The first section of this report, "1997-98 Achievements in Performance," summarizes each institution's performance on the accountability measures. The second section, "Performance Funding and Accountability: The First 18 Months," discusses the concerns and questions that have surfaced as institutions have worked to comply with the new requirements. The final section, "Recommendations for Change," suggests revisions to the current system, including new measures in distance education and education provided primarily through technology.

SECTION I: 1997-98 ACHIEVEMENTS IN PERFORMANCE ON SELECTED MEASURES OF ACCOUNTABILITY

The HECB adopted guidelines for the institutions' Accountability Plans at its June 3, 1997, meeting, and reviewed and approved the plans at its September 17, 1997, meeting. Those plans described strategies the institutions would pursue to progress toward goals on the five performance measures defined in the Legislature's proviso to the 1997-99 biennial budget:

- 1. *Undergraduate Graduation Efficiency Index***, a measure of how efficiently students complete their degrees, by taking into consideration the total number of credits earned, dropped, repeated, transferred and required for graduation.
- 2. *Undergraduate Student Retention***, the proportion of undergraduate students who continue to be enrolled from one year to the next.
- 3. *Five-year Graduation Rates***, the percentage of students who begin as freshmen who graduate within five years.
- 4. *Faculty Productivity Measure***, a mixture of measures, related to outcomes of faculty work, that are generally different for each institution.
- 5. *Unique Accountability Measure for Each Institution***, reflective of the mission of each four-year public institution.

Funds in Reserve. The Legislature placed a portion of each institution's 1997-99 appropriation in reserve, contingent upon Board approval of the Accountability Plans (for 1997-98), and the Board's assessment of institutional performance toward accountability targets (for 1998-99). In total, \$10.6 million in base funding was withheld through the performance funding process.

Release of Funds. After reviewing and approving the institutions' plans at its September 17, 1997, meeting the HECB recommended to OFM the release of all institutional funds held in reserve for the first year of the biennium.

At its July 21, 1998, meeting the HECB recommended to OFM the partial release of funds held in reserve for performance. Three institutions, Washington State University, Eastern Washington University, and Central Washington University, presented results for selected accountability measures. On the basis of performance, the HECB recommended the release of \$992,947 to WSU; \$256,800 to EWU; and \$161,000 to CWU.

The HECB notified OFM on November 13, 1998, to release the portion of the remaining funds that the institutions earned by their performance on the accountability measures. The following table shows how funds were distributed over the biennium:

Dollars in thousands

	Funds held in reserve by OFM			Funds released to institutions			
	1 st year	2 nd year		1 st year	2 nd year		Total
CWU	\$269	\$403	\$672	\$269	\$302	\$571	\$101
EWU	\$285	\$428	\$713	\$285	\$385	\$670	\$43
The Evergreen State College	\$144	\$217	\$361	\$144	\$153	\$297	\$64
UW	\$2,019	\$3,029	\$5,048	\$2,019	\$2,562	\$4,581	\$467
WSU	\$1,204	\$1,807	\$3,011	\$1,204	\$1,199	\$2,403	\$607
WWU	\$342	\$514	\$856	\$342	\$331	\$673	\$183
Total	\$4,263	\$6,398	\$10,661	\$4,263	\$4,932	\$9,195	\$1,465

Note: Numbers have been rounded. Exact figures are reported by institution later in this report.

1997-98 PERFORMANCE ON ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES

Following is a summary of performance by each institution on the accountability measures. Each summary concludes with a description of the fiscal impact on each institution of the 1997-1999 accountability initiative.

Central Washington University

CWU **met** its accountability targets for:

- Undergraduate student retention
- Faculty productivity (3 of 3 measures)
- Institution-specific measures (3 of 3 measures)

CWU **did not meet** its accountability targets for:

- Graduation efficiency of native and transfer students
- Undergraduate five-year graduation rate

For the 1997-99 biennium, OFM held in reserve \$672,000 of funds appropriated to CWU. When the HECB approved CWU's accountability plan, OFM released all of the institution's planning resources (\$269,000). In addition, CWU claimed \$302,250 (75 percent) of the funds that were

contingent upon its performance on the 1997-98 accountability measures. Overall, CWU received \$571,250 (85 percent) of its planning and performance funds.

Eastern Washington University

EWU **met** its accountability targets for:

- Undergraduate student retention
- Undergraduate five-year graduation rate
- Faculty productivity (3 of 3 measures)
- Institution-specific measure (1 of 1 measure)

EWU **did not meet** its accountability targets for:

- Graduation efficiency of native and transfer students

For the 1997-99 biennium, OFM held in reserve \$713,000 of funds appropriated to EWU. When the HECB approved EWU's accountability plan, OFM released all of the institution's planning resources (\$285,000). In addition, EWU claimed \$385,200 (90 percent) of the funds that were contingent upon performance on the 1997-98 accountability measures. Overall, EWU received \$670,200 (94 percent) of its planning and performance funds.

The Evergreen State College

TESC **met** its accountability targets for:

- Graduation efficiency of native and transfer students
- Undergraduate student retention
- Institution-specific measures (3 of 3 measures)

TESC **did not meet** its accountability targets for:

- Undergraduate five-year graduation rate
- Faculty productivity (1 of 1 measure)

For the 1997-99 biennium, OFM held in reserve \$361,000 of funds appropriated to TESC. When the HECB approved TESC's accountability plan, OFM released all of the institution's planning resources (\$144,000). In addition, TESC claimed \$152,959 (70 percent) of the funds that were contingent upon its performance on the 1997-98 accountability measures. Overall, TESC received \$296,959 (82 percent) of its planning and performance funds.

University of Washington

UW **met** its accountability targets for:

- Graduation efficiency of transfer students
- Undergraduate student retention
- Undergraduate five-year graduation rate
- Faculty productivity (1 of 4 measures)
- Institution-specific measures (4 of 4 measures)

UW **did not meet** its accountability targets for:

- Graduation efficiency of native students
- Faculty productivity (3 of 4 measures)

For the 1997-99 biennium, OFM held in reserve \$5,048,000 of funds appropriated to UW. When the HECB approved UW's accountability plan, OFM released all of the institution's planning resources (\$2,019,000). In addition, UW claimed \$2,561,848 (85 percent) of the funds that were contingent upon its performance on the 1997-98 accountability measures. Overall, UW received \$4,580,848 (91 percent) of its planning and performance funds.

Washington State University

WSU **met** its accountability targets for:

- Graduation efficiency of native and transfer students
- Faculty productivity (2 of 3 measures)
- Institution-specific measures (4 of 4 measures)

WSU **did not meet** its accountability targets for:

- Undergraduate student retention
- Undergraduate five-year graduation rate
- Faculty productivity (1 of 3 measures)

For the 1997-99 biennium, OFM held in reserve \$3,011,000 of funds appropriated to WSU. When the HECB approved WSU's accountability plan, OFM released all of the institution's planning resources (\$1,204,000). In addition, WSU claimed \$1,199,845 (66 percent) of the funds that were contingent upon its performance on the 1997-98 accountability measures. Overall, WSU received \$2,403,845 (80 percent) of its planning and performance funds.

Western Washington University

WWU **met** its accountability targets for:

- Undergraduate five-year graduation rate
- Faculty productivity (1 of 3 measures)
- Institution-specific measures (2 of 2 measures)

WWU **did not meet** its accountability targets for:

- Graduation efficiency of native and transfer students
- Undergraduate student retention
- Faculty productivity (2 of 3 measures)

For the 1997-99 biennium, OFM held in reserve \$859,000 of funds appropriated to WWU. When the HECB approved WWU's accountability plan, OFM released all of the institution's planning resources (\$342,000). In addition, WWU claimed \$331,385 (64 percent) of the funds that were

contingent upon its performance on the 1997-98 accountability measures. Overall, WWU received \$673,385 (78 percent) of its planning and performance funds.

Institutional Reports. Individual institutional summaries of performance on all of the accountability measures are in Appendix A of this report.

SUMMARY OF 1997-98 ACCOUNTABILITY PERFORMANCE OVERALL

Among the 58 separate performance measures reported, institutions met or exceeded 39 (67 percent) of them. This performance earned the institutions \$4,933,438 or 77 percent of the \$6,398,000 in funds held in reserve. Conversely, 23 percent (\$1,464,562) of the funds will not be eligible for release. For the biennium, institutions received 86 percent of the reserve funds, taking into consideration both planning and performance funds.

Recommendation for Release of Accountability Funds. Higher Education Coordinating Board recommends to the Office of Financial Management the release of accountability funds held in reserve for FY 1999 as follows: Central Washington University: \$141,050; Eastern Washington University: \$128,400; The Evergreen State College: \$152,959; University of Washington: \$2,561,848; Washington State University: \$206,898; and Western Washington University: \$331,336.

SECTION II: PERFORMANCE FUNDING AND ACCOUNTABILITY: THE FIRST 18 MONTHS

As part of their final performance reports to the HECB, each four-year university and college prepared an evaluation of progress on accountability measures. In those reports, institutions discussed the challenges they had faced, strategies they had tried, and successes and disappointments they had experienced. Each campus recommended changes that would help it improve.

Although many of these changes were specific to the institution, the institutions collectively forwarded five recommendations to the HECB for its consideration regarding changes in the accountability initiative (see Appendix B). The concerns that underlie these recommendations provide a framework for a review of the first 18 months of the accountability initiative. Although 18 months is a brief trial period for an initiative of this magnitude, it is useful to consider its current status and emerging issues.

CURRENT STATUS

•Public accountability for performance to the state and to other external constituents is widely accepted and practiced.

With its first Master Plan, *Building a System*, the HECB in 1988 underscored the importance of an accountability system that would improve student learning and provide a record of institutional performance. The assessment initiative that emerged from that Master Plan directed the institutions to create systematic ways to collect information about students at critical junctures: when students entered college, at an intermediate point between matriculation and graduation, when they completed their majors, and after they graduated. This decade of assessment practice — a deliberate and systematic focus on evaluating strategies for improving education — provides a strong foundation from which to consider the new performance measures.

This foundation helps in two ways. First, most institutions already have conducted institutional studies on topics such as retention, time-to-degree, or graduation efficiency. This wealth of information informs the conversation by helping to identify where the problems are, what strategies might work to address them, and what the potential consequences of different approaches might be. For instance, many institutions are aware that an umbrella measure for undergraduate student retention may mask problem areas with particular groups of students. A strong upper-division retention rate may help the overall retention numbers to look good, while disguising a weaker freshman retention rate. Assessment studies direct institutional attention to the problem areas.

The second way a foundation of assessment practice informs the new performance measures is that it has engendered a way of thinking about change that is now integral to institutional planning and policy. Institutions have become more accustomed to asking, and responding to, critical

assessment questions: What do we know about our performance? What do we need to change? What strategies will help us change? And finally, how will this change affect the quality of education? To conduct the business of education in an environment where it is routine to ask these questions — to expect a “culture of evidence” — was not commonplace ten years ago. The cycle of information-collection/decision-making/intervention/evaluation lends itself well to work on the new performance measures.

Assessment is not, however, the only means by which institutions demonstrate accountability. In a competitive marketplace, institutions must respond to a variety of forces that assess educational quality. Regional and disciplinary accreditation associations regularly review and judge the quality of institutions and programs. Foundations and organizations award grant applications that must meet an established set of performance criteria. Competitive market forces enable students to “vote with their feet.” National rankings report the relative standing of state institutions. Licensure and certification agencies provide feedback about the preparation of graduates. Public opinion polls (such as the statewide 1995 Elway study or the more recent 1998 Spokane study) give opportunities for Washington residents to comment upon their perceptions of the state’s higher education institutions. In short, there are many ways the institutions are held “accountable” and the quality of education is judged.

- ***The focus on specific performance measures has encouraged spirited conversation and creative thinking.***

One effect of the accountability initiative is that it has focused institutional attention on issues most educators — and citizens — would agree are significant. Although institutions have been working on these issues for some time, the public spotlight of accountability has heightened interest. Vigorous, campus-wide discussions about strategies to improve retention, graduation rate, etc. have taken place over the past 18 months, as faculty and administrators together have considered what variables within their control might have a positive impact on change.

The reference to student learning outcomes in the context of the accountability system also gave rise to a pilot project to evaluate the writing of college seniors at all of the public baccalaureates. This project involved faculty from five different disciplines, writing specialists, and members of the professional community. Over four days, participants created a set of common criteria to evaluate papers written by students in their senior year; participants then applied those criteria as they read and judged the papers. Opportunities for this type of spirited exchange of views across disciplines, professions, and institutions are rare, yet they are imperative if higher education is to consider seriously the learning outcomes of a baccalaureate education. Ironically, although this initiative was prompted by accountability, it may not fit easily into a quantitative structure of targets and goals. Washington’s students will benefit, however, if we can figure out ways to encourage more innovations of this nature.

- ***An accountability system that is striving to improve efficiency, productivity, and quality is bound to evoke tension.***

One goal of accountability is, literally, to account for the investment of public funds in higher education. Another goal is to improve the higher education system. To meet these goals, the sometimes-competing aims of efficiency, productivity, and quality must be balanced. The looming access challenge posed by Washington's changing demographics is inescapable, and institutions recognize that they will continue to be pressed to find more efficient and productive ways to deliver education. At the same time, both the Legislature and institutions are committed to maintaining a high quality of education. The inevitable tension in striving to meet all of these ends serves an important role. An education system that errs too far on the side of quality at the expense of efficiency and productivity is unlikely to survive, and vice versa. Continued efforts to resolve these tensions should lead to a middle ground where efficiency and productivity are considered significant, but not exclusive components of a high quality education.

EMERGING ISSUES

•Institutions are committed to striving for continuous improvement in their performance on the three common measures. However, the goals and timetable for reaching them may need to be reassessed in order to produce educational practices that are in the best interests of students.

The Legislature stipulated goals for the three common measures of undergraduate student retention, graduation efficiency, and five-year graduation rate.

<i>Measures</i>	<i>Goals</i>
Undergraduate student retention	
Research Universities	95 percent
Comprehensive Universities and College	90 percent
Graduation efficiency	
Freshmen ("native")	.95
Transfer students	.90
Graduation rates	
Research Universities	65 percent
Comprehensive Universities and College	55 percent

Research studies have shown that retention and graduation rates tend to be higher in highly selective institutions. Even within the general categories of "research universities" and "comprehensive universities," there is considerable variation in selectivity among Washington's public institutions. For this reason, the same goals may not be appropriate for all institutions. (Graduation efficiency is a new measure and research on it is only beginning.) With only one year of data on which to base judgement, it would be prudent to return to this issue at the end of the next biennium when three years of trend data are available.

Further, the eight-year timetable created by the HECB to assure that institutions make “meaningful and substantial progress” toward the goals gradually increases the percentage of improvement required each year. In this first year of implementation, the percentage of improvement (7 percent) was the smallest annual increment expected. Collectively, institutions met targets on 50 percent of these measures.

It may be that the relatively short period of time to implement strategies inhibited progress toward the goals. However, it is questionable whether institutions will be able to develop educationally sound strategies to meet continually escalating targets. The pressure to meet the targets or risk losing substantial portions of reserve funds will dramatically ratchet up the stakes, and cause institutions to consider strategies for meeting accountability goals that are at odds with other statewide goals (such as increasing access), or that would diminish the quality of students’ educational experiences. This would be of greater concern if the state significantly increased the amount of funds linked to performance measures.

- ***A system that withholds appropriated funds pending achievement at designated performance levels may discourage creativity and innovation.***

In this first biennium of performance funding, 23 percent of the reserve funds — almost \$1.5 million — will go to the Education Savings Account instead of to the institutions to which the funds were initially appropriated. Ten percent of the Education Savings Account is marked for higher education for distinguished professorships and graduate fellowships. Although the \$1.5 million represents a very small portion of the overall higher education budget, it is not an insignificant sum of money for the system to forego. If this trend persists, higher education will lose resources that might better be used to improve educational practices.

In the long term, rather than withholding base funds, a better approach may be to provide incentives that encourage innovative approach to improving performance, and to provide support to make continuous progress toward state goals. At the same time, it may be necessary to “stay the course” for another biennium until sufficient data has been gathered on which to base recommendations about the current goals and the appropriate rate of change.

- ***A focus on student learning outcomes is emerging from a variety of sources.***

Colleges and universities have always evaluated student work, and faculty have routinely identified goals and objectives for their classes. For almost a decade, a subtle shift in emphasis has occurred as the movement to identify and measure student learning outcomes has gained momentum. At the classroom level, this shift may represent a change in focus, from “What do I plan to teach?” to “What do I want students to know and be able to do, and how will I know they

Many forces are bringing about this shift in emphasis, and influencing conversations about student learning outcomes in Washington, including accreditation, assessment, returning adults seeking credit for prior learning, professional communities with clear standards for performance, and virtual universities. One of the most influential forces is Washington’s K-12 standards-based

reform effort. The new standards — essential academic learning requirements — already are being assessed at the fourth and seventh grades.

The Certificate of Mastery, which is currently required for a high school diploma, will certify students' attainment of the standards in reading, writing, communication, and math. The Certificate of Mastery in these areas will become mandatory for the class graduating in 2006. Other content areas may be added as state-level assessments become available.

As students emerge from this system, they are likely to be better prepared academically and more sophisticated in their expectations of a learning environment. In order to align more effectively with Washington's education systems, it will be important to clarify the qualitative differences among levels of education. By identifying the common threads in students' education, it will be easier to scaffold students' experiences so they are methodically working their way to greater sophistication and complexity of knowledge and skills.

A coordinated approach to developing student learning outcomes has begun with the senior writing pilot project described earlier in this paper. In addition, individual campuses are exploring these issues at program and institutional levels. By giving greater visibility and priority to this work, higher education can begin to rise to the challenge of identifying and assessing some of the student learning outcomes represented by a baccalaureate education.

SECTION III: PERFORMANCE FUNDING AND ACCOUNTABILITY: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGE

ESSB 6108 directs the HECB to recommend to the OFM and appropriate legislative committees additions, deletions, or revisions to the performance and accountability measures incorporated into the 1997-99 biennial budget by January 1998. These recommendations are to be developed in consultation with the six public baccalaureate institutions of higher education, and *may* include additional performance indicators to measure successful student learning and other student outcomes for possible inclusion in the 1999-01 operating budget. In addition, they *shall* include measures of performance demonstrating specific and measurable improvements related to distance education and education provided primarily through technology (*ESSB 6108, Laws of 1998, Chapter 454, Sections 601 - 610*).

The accountability initiative is still in its early stages, and much has been learned in these first 18 months. As we move toward a second generation of accountability thinking, it will be critical in the next two years to pose the questions, "How can accountability help to make changes in higher education that are in the best interests of students in this state? What policies are most likely to help us develop a system that will serve all students well?" Based on a review of the first 18 months of the accountability initiative, and taking into consideration the institutions' recommendations for change, the following recommendations are put forward for the Board's consideration.

RECOMMENDATION 1. Institutions should continue to make continuous improvement and meaningful and substantial progress on all performance measures, and report their progress to the HECB and to the Legislature each year.

At the end of the 1999-2001 biennium, the HECB will evaluate three years of trend data and recommend changes to the legislatively mandated goals, if appropriate.

RECOMMENDATION 2. To encourage progress toward state goals, the Legislature should establish a pool of performance funds. The pool should be funded at not less than \$10 million per biennium. Approximately half of those funds, or 0.5 percent of the institutions' total budgets, should be held in reserve and awarded on the basis of performance. The other half should be pooled from a variety of sources and made available through a competitive grant process to support institutional initiatives that help to achieve state goals.

RECOMMENDATION 2a. Reserve funds from the second year of the 1997-99 biennium should be redirected to this pool, rather than to the Education Savings Account, and used to support student learning outcomes initiatives.

The current system of awarding some funds based on achieving performance targets should be maintained for the next biennium. This "stay-the-course" strategy will provide three years of trend data on which to base recommendations about the goals and pace of continuous improvement.

At the same time, a performance funding system based on incentives should be piloted to determine how well an incentive system works to encourage improvements in the higher education system that are in the best interests of students. The HECB would establish a process for evaluating institutions' proposals and for awarding funds. The HECB would report to the Legislature in January 2001 on the institutions' projects, and recommend revisions, if needed, to the performance funding system.

The HECB recognizes that the Legislature faces funding constraints that will make it difficult to create a pool of performance funds that is not derived entirely from a percentage of the base budget. The HECB also recognizes that when funds are redirected from *any* source intended for the institutions, institutions face the risk of losing resources. However, the pool of performance funds available through a competitive grant process might be drawn from a combination of some or all of the following sources:

1. Reserve funds not released for the second year of the 1998-99 biennium (all)
2. Corporate donations
3. General fund enhancement
4. Cost savings from completed capital projects
5. New enrollment funds (small percentage)
6. Tuition increases (small percentage)
7. Assessment funds (small percentage)

RECOMMENDATION 3. In collaboration with Washington's public baccalaureate institutions, the HECB shall establish distance education performance measures by June 30, 1999. No funding should be tied to these measures for the next biennium, to allow time to define the measures, establish baseline data, and resolve governance issues related to distance education and the K-20 network. The HECB will report to the Legislature in January 2001 on the outcomes of this effort and recommend next steps.

The intent of the measures is to assess the number of students gaining access to education primarily through web-based, interactive video, satellite, or other technologies, and to assess the number of opportunities available. The measures should provide information about the number of students served in courses offered primarily through distance education technology, and the number of courses/programs available. Distinctions between in-state and out-of-state students enrolled in distance education courses, and in-state students taking courses on-site and through distance education should be clarified.

There are many forms of distance education, ranging from off-campus learning centers and branch campuses to courses offered entirely over the Internet. Although all of these forms are important, the state's compelling interest is to determine to what extent technology is helping students gain access to higher education.

The HECB will work with the institutions to create common definitions and ways of measuring this form of distance education. Although all campuses may not consider this type of distance

education to be integral to their institutional missions and strategic plans, it is still important to find a way to measure current practice and progress *for the state* in this area. The HECB will establish definitions and measures by June 30, 1999. Institutions will collect data during academic year 1999-2000.

RECOMMENDATION 4. Incentive funds should be used to reinforce institutional and state initiatives in the area of student learning outcomes, and to encourage new assessment projects, particularly in the areas of quantitative skills and technological literacy. By 2003, all institutions should have student learning outcomes in place for every undergraduate academic program, aligning those outcomes where appropriate with the K-12 and community college systems. Beginning in December 2000, institutions should report annually to the HECB on progress in establishing and assessing these outcomes. By December 2000, institutions should report to the HECB on the development of the senior writing project.

Important work on a statewide look at student learning outcomes has begun with the senior writing pilot project described in the second section of this paper. Similar projects in the areas of quantitative skills (reasoning and problem-solving processes used frequently in math, statistics, and other quantitative-oriented disciplines), and technological literacy (ability to use technology in ways typically used in the professional work place) could be undertaken as well. Central Washington University already has an institution-specific performance measure to develop student learning outcomes for all of its academic programs. The University of Washington is considering using student learning outcomes as a measure of faculty productivity. Most institutions already have begun work to establish student learning outcomes in academic programs. Incentive funds would provide an opportunity to encourage institutions to expand work quickly in this very important area.

APPENDICES

Appendix A Accountability Performance Tables

Appendix B ICAO Recommendations

**CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
ACCOUNTABILITY PERFORMANCE FOR 1997-98**

Total Resources Held in Reserve for the 1997-99 Biennium: \$672,000

1997-98: **\$269,000** (for Plan Approval); 1998-99: **\$403,000** (for Accountability Performance in 1997-98)

	Statewide Goals	1995-96 Baseline	“Gap”	Planning Funds Released in September 97	1997-98 Target	1997-98 Actual	Percent Target Attained	1998-99 Funds Tied to Target	Percent Funds in Reserve	Performance Funds Released in July 98	Performance Funds Eligible for Release	Performance Funds Not Eligible for Release
ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN:				\$269,000								
ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES:												
1. Graduation Efficiency Index:								\$40,300	10%			
Native Students	95	91.9	3.1		92.12	87.87	0	\$20,150	5%	0	0	\$20,150
Transfer Students	90	84.6	5.4		84.98	83.15	0	\$20,150	5%	0	0	\$20,150
2. Retention Rate:					75.49%	80.3%	100%	\$60,450	15%	0	\$60,450	
3. 5-Year Graduation Rate:					40.59%	38.9%	0	\$60,450	15%	0	0	\$60,450
Institution												
4. Faculty Productivity Measure:								\$120,900	30%			
Student Learning Outcomes	100%	1.3%	98.7%		20%	32.9%	100%	\$60,450	15%	\$60,450		
Faculty-student Mentoring (percent faculty)	33.3%	14.5%	18.8%		18.4%	26.3%	100%	\$40,300	10%	\$40,300		
SCH/Instructional FTE Faculty	1:1058	1:1000	1:0058		1:1004	1:1007	100%	\$20,150	5%	\$20,150		
5. Institution Specific Measure:								\$120,900	30%			
Service to Transfer Students	90%	47.7%	42.3%		51%	79.5%	100%	\$40,300	10%	\$40,300		
Diversity	25%	19.91%	5.09%		20.27%	21.6%	100%	\$40,300	10%		\$40,300	
Internships	10%	6.52%	3.48%		6.76%	6.76%	100%	\$40,300	10%		\$40,300	
Total				\$269,000				\$403,000	100 %	\$161,200	\$141,050	\$100,750

The Washington Legislature in its 1997-99 Budget defined the Statewide Goals, Baseline Year, and “Performance Gap” in budget provisos for the first three measures.

**EASTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
ACCOUNTABILITY PERFORMANCE FOR 1997-98**

Total Resources Held in Reserve for the 1997-99 Biennium: \$713,000

1997-98: **\$285,000** (for Plan Approval); 1998-99: **\$428,000** (for Accountability Performance in 1997-98)

	Statewide Goals	1995-96 Baseline	“Gap”	Planning Funds Released in September 97	1997-98 Target	1997-98 Actual	Percent Target Attained	1998-99 Funds Tied to Target	Percent Funds in Reserve	Performance Funds Released in July 98	Performance Funds Eligible for Release	Performance Funds Not Eligible for Release
ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN:				\$285,000								
ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES:												
1. Graduation Efficiency Index:								\$42,800	10%			
Native Students	95	88.3	6.7		88.77	87.7	0	\$21,400	5%	0	0	\$21,400
Transfer Students	90	78.3	11.7		79.12	77.3	0	\$21,400	5%	0	0	\$21,400
2. Retention Rate:					86.75%	89.3%	100%	\$85,600	20%	0	\$85,600	
3. 5-Year Graduation Rate:					39.66%	47.9%	100%	\$42,800	10%	0	\$42,800	
Institution												
4. Faculty Productivity Measure:								\$128,400	30%			
Faculty Workload	300	274	26		275.82	295.5	100%	\$21,400	5%	\$21,400		
Use of Technology by Faculty	40	0	40		2.8	3	100%	\$42,800	10%	\$42,800		
Instructional Efficiency	85%	47%	38%		49.66%	54%	100%	\$64,200	15%	\$64,200		
5. Institution Specific Measure:												
Student Internships/Coop: Number of Students	2,740	2,284	456		2,316	2,653	100%	\$128,400	30%	\$128,400		
Total:				\$285,000				\$428,000	100%	\$256,800	\$128,400	\$42,800

The Washington Legislature in its 1997-99 Budget defined the Statewide Goals, Baseline Year, and “Performance Gap” in budget provisos for the first three measures.

THE EVERGREEN STATE COLLEGE **ACCOUNTABILITY PERFORMANCE FOR 1997-98**

Total Resources Held in Reserve for the 1997-99 Biennium: \$361,000
 1997-98: ***\$144,000*** (for Plan Approval); 1998-99: ***\$217,000*** (for Accountability Performance in 1997-98)

	Statewide Goals	1995-96 Baseline	“Gap”	Planning Funds Released in September 97	1997-98 Target	1997-98 Actual	Percent Target Attained	1998-99 Funds Tied to Target	Percent Funds in Reserve	Performance Funds Released in July 98	Performance Funds Eligible for Release	Performance Funds Not Eligible for Release
ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN:				\$144,000								
ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES:												
1. Graduation Efficiency Index:								\$43,4300	20%			
Native Students	95	91.6	3.4		91.84	92.22	100%	\$21,700	10%	0	\$21,700	
Transfer Students	90	89.4	0.6		89.44	90.26	100%	\$21,700	10%	0	\$21,700	
2. Retention Rate:					74.19%	77.1%	100%	\$43,400	20%	0	\$43,400	
3. 5-Year Graduation Rate:					54.16%	49.1%	0	\$21,700	10%	0	0	\$21,700
Institution												
4. Faculty Productivity Measure:												
Capacity for Life-Long Learning Index	37.66	31.82	5.84		32.23	31.83	2%	\$43,400	20%	0	\$1,059	\$42,341
5. Institution Specific Measure:								\$65,100	30%			
Retention of Students of Color	90%	71%	19%		72.3%	79.7%	100%	\$10,850	5%		\$10,850	
Faculty Development/ Diversity	50%	26%	24%		27.7 %	42.3%	100%	\$32,550	15%		\$32,550	
Student Diversity Outcome	3.85	3.05	0.8		3.11	3.28	100%	\$21,700	10%		\$21,700	
Total:				\$144,000				\$217,000	100%	0	\$152,959	\$64,041

The Washington Legislature in its 1997-99 Budget defined the Statewide Goals, Baseline Year, and “Performance Gap” in budget provisos for the first three measures.

**UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
ACCOUNTABILITY PERFORMANCE FOR 1997-98**

Total Resources Held in Reserve for the 1997-99 Biennium: \$5,048,000

1997-98: **\$2,019,000** (for Plan Approval); 1998-99: **\$3,029,000** (for Accountability Performance in 1997-98)

	Statewide Goals	1995-96 Baseline	“Gap”	Planning Funds Released in September 97	1997-98 Target	1997-98 Actual	Percent Target Attained	1998-99 Funds Tied to Target	Percent Funds in Reserve	Performance Funds Released in July 98	Performance Funds Eligible for Release	Performance Funds Not Eligible for Release
ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN:				\$2,019,00								
ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES:												
1. Graduation Efficiency Index:								\$605,800	20%			
Native Students	95	89.1	5.9		89.51	89.4	73%	\$302,900	10%	0	\$221,634	\$81,266
Transfer Students	90	80.4	9.6		81.07	81.4	100%	\$302,900	10%	0	\$302,900	0
2. Retention Rate:	95%	86.7%	8.3%		87.28%	87.4%	100%	\$605,800	20%	0	\$605,800	0
3. 5-Year Graduation Rate:	65%	61.7%	3.3%		61.93%	63.9%	100%	\$605,800	20%	0	\$605,800	0
Institution												
4. Faculty Productivity:								\$605,800	20%			
percent Course	80%	71.36%	8.64%		72.3%	70.2%	0	\$151,450	5%	0	0	\$151,450
Quality of Instruction	98%	94.5%	3.5 %		94.75%	93.7%	0	\$151,450	5%	0	0	\$151,450
Research Funding (\$\$\$ per Faculty)	\$203,946	\$197,948	\$5,998		\$201,927	\$213,530	100%	\$151,450	5%	0	\$151,450	0
Student Credit Hours per Faculty FTE	212.60	202.47	10.13		203.2	202.80	45%	\$151,450	5%	0	\$68,464	\$82,986
5. Institution Specific:								\$605,800	20%			
Undergraduate	600	300	300		321	653	100%	\$151,450	5%	0	\$151,450	0
Intensive Individual Instruction as percent of Credits	5%	3.8%	1.2%		3.9%	4%	100%	\$151,450	5%	0	\$151,450	0
Number of Students in Internships	2,000	500	1,500		605	696	100%	\$151,450	5%	0	\$151,450	0
Student Research Experience	25%	20.7%	4.3%		21%	22.4%	100%	\$151,450	5%	0	\$151,450	0
Total:				\$2,019,000				\$3,029,000	100		\$2,561,848	\$467,152

The Washington Legislature in its 1997-99 Budget defined the Statewide Goals, Baseline Year, and “Performance Gap” in budget provisos for the first three measures.

**WESTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
ACCOUNTABILITY PERFORMANCE FOR 1997-98**

Total Resources Held in Reserve for the 1997-99 Biennium: \$856,000

1997-98: **\$342,000** (for Plan Approval); 1998-99: **\$514,000** (for Accountability Performance in 1997-98)

	Statewide Goals	1995-96 Baseline	“Gap”	Planning Funds Released in September 97	1997-98 Target	1997-98 Actual	Percent Target Attained	1998-99 Funds Tied to Target	Percent Funds in Reserve	Performance Funds Released in July 98	Performance Funds Eligible for Release	Performance Funds Not Eligible for Release
ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN:				\$342,000								
ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES:												
1. Graduation Efficiency Index:								\$102,800	20%			
Native Students	95	86.8	8.2		87.37	86.43	0	\$51,400	10%	0	0	\$51,400
Transfer Students	90	80.2	9.8		80.89	80.57	54%	\$51,400	10%	0	\$27,562	\$23,838
2. Retention Rate:					87.40%	85.8%	0	\$51,400	10%	0	0	\$51,400
3. 5-Year Graduation Rate:					52.21%	54.7%	100%	\$77,100	15%	0	\$77,100	
Institution												
4. Faculty Productivity								\$128,500	25%			
Undergrad Degrees/Upper Division FTE	0.420	0.396	0.024		0.398	0.361	0	\$51,400	10%	0	0	\$51,400
Individualized Credits/FTE Student	1.60	1.424	0.176		1.436	1.487	100%	\$51,400	10%	0	\$51,400	
SCH/Undergrad FTE in Writing Courses	2.50	2.030	0.470		2.063	2.057	82%	\$25,700	5%	0	\$21,074	\$4,626
5. Institution Specific Measure:								\$154,200	30%			
Computer Lab Hours/ Undergrad FTE	10.5	8.89	1.610		9.003	22.5	100%	\$77,100	15%		\$77,100	
Advising Contacts/ Undergrad FTE	1.15	0.935	0.215		0.950	1.012	100%	\$77,100	15%		\$77,100	
Total:				\$342,000				\$514,000	100%	0	\$331,336	\$182,664

The Washington Legislature in its 1997-99 Budget defined the Statewide Goals, Baseline Year, and “Performance Gap” in budget provisos for the first three measures.

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY
ACCOUNTABILITY PERFORMANCE FOR 1997-98

Total Resources Held in Reserve for the 1997-99 Biennium: \$3,011,000

1997-98: **\$1,204,000** (for Plan Approval); 1998-99: **\$1,807,000** (for Accountability Performance in 1997-98)

	Statewide Goals	1995-96 Baseline	“Gap”	Planning Funds Released in September 97	1997-98 Target	1997-98 Actual	Percent Target Attained	1998-99 Funds Tied to Target	Percent Funds in Reserve	Performance Funds Released in July 98	Performance Funds Eligible for Release	Performance Funds Not Eligible for Release
ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN:				\$1,204,000								
ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES:												
1. Graduation Efficiency Index:								\$180,700	10%			
Native Students	95	89.6	7.8		89.96	90.54	100%	\$90,350	5%		\$90,350	
Transfer Students	90	79.8	15.2		80.47	81.84	100%	\$90,350	5%		\$90,350	
2. Retention Rate:												
	95%	84.6%	10.4%		85.33%	84.2%	0	\$361,400	20%	\$361,400*	0*	\$361,400
3. 5-Year Graduation Rate:												
Institution	65%	55.7%	9.3%		56.35%	53.2%	0	\$180,700	10%		0	\$180,700
4. Faculty Productivity												
SCH per Ranked Faculty	236.5	197.1	39.4		199.9	198.9	64%	\$180,700	10%	\$179,797**	\$900	\$65,000
Individualized Upper Div./ FTE Faculty	5.4	2.7	2.7		2.9	3.0	100%	\$180,700	10%		\$180,700	
percent Faculty Completing Scholarly	95%	79.3%	15.7%		80.4%	80.5%	100%	\$180,700	10%		\$180,700	
5. Institution Specific Measure:												
SCH through Distance Ed. off campus	34,422	17,211	17,211		23,235	24,935	100%	\$180,700	10%	\$180,700		
Distance Ed. Degrees off campus	12	3	9		6	6	100%	\$90,350	5%	\$90,350		
Technology-based Courses on campus	325	7	318		67	137	100%	\$90,350	5%		\$90,350	
percent Classrooms with Full Technology	90%	42.4%	47.6%		55%	60%	100%	\$180,700	10%	\$180,700		
Total:				\$1,204,000				\$1,807,000	100%	\$992,947	\$632,450 [\$206,898]**	\$607,100

* Corrected figures for actual performance indicate that the release of funds in July was premature.

** Due to a calculation error, more money was released than was due. This figure should have been \$115,648.

*** Figure in brackets is the adjusted sum to be released.

The Washington Legislature in its 1997-99 Budget defined the Statewide Goals, Baseline Year, and “Performance Gap” in budget provisos for the first three measures.

RESOLUTION 98-49

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board was charged by the Legislature to recommend to OFM and appropriate legislative committees by January 1999 any additions, deletions, or revisions to the performance and accountability measures incorporated into the 1997-99 biennial budget; and

WHEREAS, The measures are to be developed in consultation with the six public baccalaureate institutions of higher education; and

WHEREAS, The measures *may* include additional performance indicators to measure successful student learning and other student outcomes for possible inclusion in the 1999-01 operating budget; and

WHEREAS, The measures *shall* include measures of performance demonstrating specific and measurable improvements related to distance education and education provided primarily through technology; and

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board has reviewed the institutions' 1997-98 performances and taken into consideration the institutions' recommendations for change;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the attached Performance Funding and Accountability Progress Report and forwards the recommendations to the Legislature for its consideration.

Adopted:

December 7, 1998

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

2000 MASTER PLAN PROCESS

December 1998

BACKGROUND

State law [RCW 28B.80.330(3)] directs the HECB to: Prepare *a comprehensive master plan that includes but is not limited to:*

- (a) Assessments of the state's higher education needs...*
- (b) Recommendations on enrollment and other policies and actions to meet those needs;*
- (c) Guidelines for continuing education, adult education, public service, and other higher education programs.*

The statute further identifies the primary audience for this plan as the Legislature and governor, to whom the HECB is directed to submit the plan by January 1, 2000.

In September, HECB Chair Bob Craves appointed a Master Plan Subcommittee to organize and direct the work involved in the creation of the 2000 Master Plan. The Master Plan Subcommittee is Bob Craves, Gay Selby, Anne Ramsay-Jenkins, and Jim Faulstich. Since September, the subcommittee has met two times to draft the process that will lead to the 2000 Master Plan. What follows is the subcommittee's recommendation for that process:

Master Plan Profile

Some public policy and research documents are intended to describe what has occurred in a policy area in the past or to report on what the current state of an industry or institution. The 2000 Master Plan should be neither a status report nor simply a background document, but one that presents policy makers with specific, concrete proposals for enhancing the quality, effectiveness, and availability of postsecondary education in Washington state.

Upon its adoption by the Legislature, the plan becomes state higher education policy until the next plan is adopted — in 2004. Therefore, the 2000 Master Plan should anticipate change and demand, at a minimum, through 2004. However, given that the outlook of the 1996 Master Plan was through 2010, and the Governor's 2020 Commission on the Future of Higher Education recently completed a vision statement for higher education through the year 2020, the scope of this Master Plan should extend 2010.

The Board intends that the process that leads to the 2000 Master Plan should be open and inclusive, circumspect and challenging. Further, the process should reflect the statutory role of the board to represent the "broad public interest" in higher education, above the interests of individual institutions.

In November, the Governor's 2020 Commission on the Future of Higher Education completed a broad vision statement for higher education. A product of ten months of discussion among 30 leaders in business and education, the final report raises important and interesting proposals that deserve further research and development. The Commission's report lays thought-provoking groundwork the 2000 Master Plan. The issues raised in the 2020 Commission's report should be addressed in the research and issue development phase of the development of the 2000 Master Plan.

2000 Master Plan Draft Timeline

The process leading to the 2000 Master Plan will proceed in three phases: (1) issue identification and development, through April of 1999; (2) information gathering and research, through August of 1999; and (3) Plan refinement and adoption, from August through November, 1999. A draft timetable for Master Plan work follows.

Roles of Full HECB and Subcommittee

The role of the full HECB will be

- to identify the vision and key issues to be addressed in the 2000 Master Plan;
- to approve at key points the work of the Master Plan Subcommittee;
- to participate when possible in public meetings, fact finding, and other work of the subcommittee; and
- to approve the final Master Plan document.

The role of the subcommittee will be

- to represent the full Board in the Master Plan process, before stakeholders, policymakers, and citizens;
- to communicate to the full Board how the work of the Master Plan is proceeding, throughout the process;
- to elicit from the full Board feedback on the draft Master Plan as it is developed; and
- to direct and work with HECB staff in gathering the facts, research, and community input need to build a Master Plan.

Process Components

Critical elements of the Master Plan process will include the following:

/// **HECB Member Strategic Planning.** The input and review of the full Board will be particularly important at two junctures. The Board will identify the major themes and issues to be addressed in the Master Plan. Regular HECB meetings will include reports from the subcommittee and full board discussion on issue development; members will report on advisory meetings with stakeholders. In July, the Board will meet to discuss, refine, and approve draft Master Plan recommendations.

/// **Regular HECB Subcommittee Meetings.** The HECB Master Plan Subcommittee will meet regularly to discuss emerging issues and ideas that arise from conversations and research on the Master Plan, to share feedback from advisory meetings and stakeholder conversations, to discuss and refine the work plan, to identify key points for full board formal participation, and to review and direct staff work. A minimum of two subcommittee members should be present at each meeting.

/// **Advisory Meetings / Stakeholder Input.** In order to garner as much public input as possible, and in order that the final Master Plan truly reflects "...the broad public interest," staff and board members will meet with stakeholders of public higher education through the first phase of the planning process. These advisory meetings should be completed by the beginning of April 1999, to allow ample time to research and examine issues and ideas that surface in stakeholder conversations.

The stakeholders should represent view of citizens in urban and rural areas of the state, in western and eastern Washington. A minimum of two HECB members should be present at each advisory meeting. These meetings will be organized around key issues identified by the full board, and will include but not limited to representatives of the following:

- **Public and private education institutions:** current and former trustees and regents; students; faculty; and administrators;
- **K-12 education:** students & families; faculty; and administrators;
- **Labor:** organized labor groups as well as other representatives of Washington state's diverse workforce;
- **Business:** small and large enterprises, as well as business organizations such as the Washington Roundtable and Chambers of Commerce;
- **State lawmakers,** and
- **Community members** from across the state.

The purpose of the meetings will be to

- 1.) **understand the issues shaping and confronting public higher education** in the near future, and
- 2.) **to identify new and creative strategies** to enhance the quality and availability of postsecondary education in Washington state's system of higher education.

The Board may wish to include a "virtual" stakeholder meeting component in this process to allow citizens — the ultimate stakeholders — to voice directly their input on the 2000 Master Plan.

/// **Workforce Higher Education Needs Assessment.** For the 1996 Master Plan the HECB used a survey as a tool to gauge consumer expectations about higher education services: whether they expected their children to continue their education after high school, whether they thought their children would be able to attend a Washington state public institution, etc. This citizen perspective was instrumental in shaping goals for the level of service that would be needed to meet the demand of the citizens of the state. And HECB goals for participation in higher

education recently were reiterated and expanded in the goals set by the Governor's 2020 Commission on the Future of Post-Secondary Education.

It is expected that consensus will emerge from stakeholder advisory meetings on what qualities are required of a higher education system in order to produce a well informed citizenry. The 2020 Commission also discussed this topic in great depth and at great length, as their final report shows.

What is less well known, however, is the level of education Washington state employers and workers themselves believe will be needed for an effective and productive Washington state workforce. Although the question has arisen frequently since the Legislature adopted the 1996 Master Plan, the question has received no conclusive answer.

Therefore, the 2000 Master Plan process should include a survey of state employers and workers to provide conclusive data on the level of higher education that business and labor deem essential for a highly productive workforce through 2010. The assessment should incorporate the results of existing analyses as well as new research. The assessment should be completed by May.

/// **Citizen Focus Groups** will be used to test the findings of the Workforce Higher Education Needs Assessment, and the draft themes and recommendations of the 2000 Master Plan. The focus groups should be completed by the end of June.

/// **Public Meetings.** During fall, 1999, the HECB will conduct public meetings across the state to discuss and elicit community feedback on the draft 2000 Master Plan. The meetings will be conducted in rural and urban centers of the state, in eastern and Western Washington. These meetings may include a "virtual" component that would allow the public to access the Master Plan dialogue via the Higher Education Coordinating Board Web site.

For a copy of the Master Plan Timeline, please call the HECB at (360)753-7830.

RESOLUTION 98-51

WHEREAS, State law [RCW 28B.80.330(3)] directs the HECB to prepare a comprehensive master plan which includes but is not limited to: (1) Assessments of the state's higher education needs; (2) Recommendations on enrollment and other policies and actions to meet those needs; and (3) Guidelines for continuing education, adult education, public service, and other higher education programs; and

WHEREAS, The statute further identifies the primary audience for this plan as the legislature and governor, to whom the HECB is directed to submit the plan by January 1, 2000; and

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board has established a Master Plan Subcommittee to direct and organize the work of creating the 2000 Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, The subcommittee — Bob Craves, Gay Selby, Anne Ramsay-Jenkins, and Jim Faulstich — recommend that the process leading to the 2000 Master Plan should be open and inclusive, should examine carefully the recommendations of the Governor's 2000 Commission on the Future of Higher Education, and should display the very best in public policy research and analysis;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That the full membership of the Washington State Higher Education Coordinating Board endorses and supports the process recommended by the HECB Master Plan Subcommittee for creating the 2000 Master Plan.

Adopted:

December 7, 1998

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

1999 HECB LEGISLATIVE SESSION PRIORITIES

December 7, 1998

BACKGROUND

The Washington Legislature will begin its 1999 regular session on Jan. 11 following a general election that significantly altered the makeup of the House and Senate. In the Senate, Democrats will hold a 27-22 majority after reversing what had been a 26-23 Republican advantage. In the House, Republicans and Democrats each captured 49 seats, producing joint control of that chamber for only the second time in the state's history. Republicans had held a 57-41 edge prior to the election. Organizational arrangements in the House were under discussion as this report was being prepared. The regular session will last a maximum of 105 days and will focus on the development of capital and operating budgets for the 1999-2001 biennium, which begins July 1.

The Higher Education Coordinating Board has identified a limited number of important priorities for the state's higher education system. This document presents a brief outline of these key issues and an overview of the Board's positions. It is accompanied by *Resolution 98-52*, which contains the Board's formal legislative agenda.

STATEWIDE HIGHER EDUCATION PRIORITIES

1999-2001 operating budget

The HECB's highest priority for the 1999-2001 state operating budget is the **preservation of the current level of services** at the state's six baccalaureate institutions and 32 two-year colleges. The board's top-priority enhancements include:

- **Enrollment increases** of 9,639 full-time equivalent students (6,000 FTEs at the two-year colleges and 3,639 at the four-year institutions). This increase would enable the state to respond to substantial increases in enrollment demand and to keep budgeted enrollment within 1 percent of the HECB goal for statewide college and university enrollment.
- **A \$40-million increase in financial aid funding** to implement the HECB recommendation that the State Need Grant program be based on tuition levels. The effect of this change would be to increase State Need Grant awards to students who attend public and private four-year colleges and universities, while preserving current rates for students at community and technical colleges. Detailed estimates of additional costs associated with possible enrollment and tuition increases are included under Tab 2 of this agenda package.
- **Faculty salary increases** of 4.5 percent per year and additional funding for an \$8 million "recruitment and retention" pool for the four-year college and universities. These increases would begin to stem the erosion of higher education faculty salaries and provide the

institutions with a tool to preserve program quality by retaining their most valuable faculty members.

1999-2001 capital budget

- The Board has asked the Legislature and Governor to authorize \$551 million in general obligation bonds and \$218 million in other funds to support a 1999-2001 capital budget proposal that focuses on projects that increase the **enrollment capacity** of the two- and four-year institutions, and that ensure **quality in the learning environment** through preservation and modernization of existing facilities.

Supplemental 1997-99 operating budget

The Board's recommended supplemental budget includes \$49 million for costs associated with several urgently needed community and technical college capital projects, as well as \$16 million for technology upgrades, seismic safety and other one-time budget initiatives at the two- and four-year institutions.

Tuition recommendations

- The HECB recommends that student tuition increases to be limited to the three-year average increase in per capita personal income. This would limit tuition increases to an estimated 4 percent and 3.2 percent in the coming two-year period. In addition, the Board has endorsed a proposal to allow colleges and universities the flexibility to impose additional tuition increases of up to 2 percent per year.

Accountability recommendations

- The HECB has been directed by the Legislature to review current **accountability / performance measurements** and make recommendations about how to improve the accountability process that the Legislature established in 1997. Also, the Board is directed to recommend specific performance measures for technology-based learning and distance education. The Board's recommendations are detailed in Tab 6 in this agenda package.

Higher Education Coordinating Board budget

The HECB has identified three major priorities within the agency's proposed 1999-2001 budget request: access enhancements, quality enhancements, and accountability resources. The budget includes proposals to increase funds for the State Need Grant and Work Study financial aid programs; the Distinguished professorships/graduate fellowships program; undergraduate fellowships; and the Competency-based admissions pilot projects. Additional resources also are requested for accountability and capital project planning and oversight, and for the development of the next Higher Education Master Plan for Washington State, which will be completed by January 2000.

RESOLUTION NO. 98-52

WHEREAS, State law (RCW 28B.80.330) directs the Higher Education Coordinating Board to review, evaluate and make recommendations to the Legislature and the Governor regarding budget, policy and legislative issues in consultation with the state's other education institutions; and

WHEREAS, The Board is committed to working cooperatively with the higher education institutions, the Legislature and the Governor to ensure that Washington's public higher education system maintains and improves its high quality; and

WHEREAS, The Board has reviewed the 1999-2001 operating and capital budget proposals of the state's public four-year college and universities and the community and technical colleges; and

WHEREAS, The Board has reviewed current and former tuition policies for the State of Washington and has developed a recommendation for the tuition rates established by the Legislature and Governor for Washington's college and university students; and

WHEREAS, The Board this year conducted a detailed study of financial aid issues and, in consultation with the state's public and private colleges and universities, developed a series of recommendations that will require legislative and gubernatorial approval to be fully implemented; and

WHEREAS, The Board has responded to a number of other legislative directives to prepare information and recommendations on a wide range of issues;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Board hereby adopts its 1999 legislative agenda, whose highest priorities are as follows:

1. Funding in the 1999-2001 state operating budget for 9,639 new full-time student enrollments at the state's colleges and universities;
2. Increased financial aid funding to improve the financial aid system by basing the amount of eligible students' State Need Grants to the level of their tuition;
3. Faculty salary increases of 4.5 percent in each year of the biennium, and financing of an \$8 million "recruitment and retention" pool for the four-year college and universities.
4. Authorization of \$551 in general obligation bonds and \$218 million in other funds to support capital projects designated by the Board as "critical" and "essential" to the continued growth and improvement

5. Establishment of a tuition rate-setting system based on average increases in per-capita personal income, and authorization of individual institutions and the two-year college system to independently enact additional tuition increases of up to 2 percent per year;

6. Enactment of the Board's recommendations to improve the higher education accountability and performance funding system, with an emphasis on creating incentives for colleges and universities to develop new and innovative educational strategies to improve students' learning; and

7. A budget for the Higher Education Coordinating Board that meets the need for increased student access to financial aid programs; targeted funding to recognize and reward outstanding faculty and students; resources to implement a competency-based system of college admissions; and funds to continue the Board's important roles of project planning, oversight and the development of the 2000 Master Plan for the state's higher education system.

Adopted:

December 7, 1998

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

EASTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A BACHELOR OF OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY

December 1998

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Occupational therapists provide evaluation and intervention services for people who have developmental, mental, or physical limitations. Individuals can enter the profession through three pathways: bachelor's degree program, professional entry-level master's program, or a post-professional master's program. In response to the demand for occupational therapists, particularly in rural areas of the Inland Northwest, Eastern Washington University is proposing to establish a Bachelor of Occupational Therapy (BOT). The program would focus on community-based practice and emphasize interdisciplinary practice and teamwork with other health care professionals.

The degree structure for the BOT was developed in accordance with the accreditation standards outlined by the Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education (ACOTE) within the American Occupational Therapy Association. The program's final mission statement, philosophy of education, and specific courses/syllabi, however, would be developed by the BOT program director and faculty hired to support the program. Information about a number of areas of concern to the Board are not currently available for HECB review; however considerable work has been completed and it is to the benefit of the state for this program to proceed promptly.

Current and future industry needs call for an increased supply of occupational therapists.

According to the American Occupational Therapy Association, there would be a strong demand for occupational therapists through 2005. **Student interest in the program is high.** Existing occupational programs at the University of Puget Sound and the University of Washington consistently turn away hundreds of qualified applicants annually. Graduates of these programs, and others as well across the nation, typically receive about four job offers upon completion of their programs.

The BOT's program structure is based upon the *Essential Guidelines for an Accredited Program for Occupational Therapists* of the Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education (ACOTE) within the American Occupational Therapy Association (AOTA). There are both pre-professional and professional components to the 207-216 quarter-credit program. Students should be able to complete the professional component of the program in about two years.

The diversity plan for the program would promote greater participation of people of color and those from medically under-served areas. **The assessment plan** focuses on student learning outcomes, program vitality, and faculty effectiveness.

A new program director and four new FTE faculty would support the BOT. Initially it would be housed on the Cheney campus and move to the Riverpoint Health Sciences Building in Spokane when that facility is completed. It would be supported by state funds currently held in allotment reserve. In future years, it is expected that the program would be supported by external grants as well. The estimated cost to offer the program is about \$314,164 per year; \$6,283 per FTE student.

RECOMMENDATION

Conditional approval is recommended for Eastern Washington University's proposed Bachelor of Occupational Therapy, effective immediately. Final approval is recommended upon receipt of the following: a) the vitae of the program director and program faculty, b) a final mission statement and philosophy of education for program, c) course syllabi for the occupational therapy courses, d) other changes to the program requested by the program director and program faculty, and e) the acquisition of "*developing program status*" with the Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education within the American Occupational Therapy Association.

EASTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A BACHELOR OF OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY

December 1998

BACKGROUND

Occupational Therapists provide evaluation and intervention services for people who have developmental, mental, or physical limitations. Individuals can enter the profession through three pathways: bachelor's program, professional master's program, or a post-professional master's program. In response to the demand for occupational therapists, especially in rural areas, Eastern Washington University is proposing to establish a Bachelor of Occupational Therapy (BOT). The program would provide a unique focus on community-based practice and emphasize interdisciplinary practice and teamwork with other health care professionals.

The degree structure for the BOT was developed in accordance with the accreditation standards stipulated by the Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education (ACOTE) within the American Occupational Therapy Association. But, the program's final mission statement, philosophy of education, and specific courses/syllabi would be developed by the BOT program director and faculty hired to support the program. Information about a number of areas of concern to the Board are not currently available for HECB review; however considerable work has been completed and it is to the benefit of the state for this program to proceed promptly.

NEED FOR PROGRAM

Relationship to Institutional Mission

As a regionally based comprehensive university, Eastern prepares students for post-baccalaureate employment through selected professional programs responsive to identified regional needs. The university currently offers three allied health programs — physical therapy, communication disorders, and dental hygiene — to serve the needs of the medical community and its consumers. The occupational therapy program would support Eastern's mission and complement its existing allied health programs.

Relationship to Program Plan

In March 1997, the Board granted pre-approval for EWU to develop a full proposal for an occupational therapy program.

Relationship to Other Institutions

The University of Puget Sound and the University of Washington offer undergraduate programs in occupational therapy. Earlier this year, the Board approved the University of Washington's proposed Master of Occupational Therapy that would replace the UW's existing BOT.

Occupational Demand

The BOT is responsive to the professional community of the state and particularly the Inland Northwest. According to the American Occupational Therapy Association, there would be a strong demand for occupational therapists through the year 2005. There are several factors that indicate that the demand for occupational therapy would increase.

- First is the shift to integrated care and the need for practitioners with multiple skills.
- Second is the fact that by the year 2020, the full force of the “baby-boomer” generation will be realized both in the total number and average age of older Americans. What is known about the aging of the population is that the number of those with disabilities in the population will increase, because the likelihood of having a disability increases directly with age.
- Third is the growth of community-based care and the desire to bring those with milder disabilities out of institutions and integrate them into their community.

In addition, many counties in Washington State are poorly served by primary health care providers. According to the Washington State Department of Health, 32 of Washington’s 39 counties have been designated as Federal Manpower Primary Care Shortage areas. For the field of occupational therapy, the need is particularly acute.

Finally, the proposal for the BOT includes supporting letters from about a dozen health care providers in the Inland Northwest. They include St. Luke’s Rehabilitation Institute, VNA Home Health Care Services, Empire Health Services, Sacred Heart Medical Center, and the Easter Seal Society, to name a few.

Student Interest

Student interest in occupational therapy is high. The typical ratio of qualified applicants to admissions is 7:1, making for a highly competitive selection process. The opportunities for employment and the competitive level of salaries in allied health fields have created a demand for admission to existing allied health programs that is greater than the available educational opportunities.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Curriculum

The proposed program structure is based upon the *Essential Guidelines for an Accredited Program for Occupational Therapists* of the Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education (ACOTE) within the American Occupational Therapy Association. There are both pre-professional and professional components to the curriculum.

The pre-professional curriculum is based on Eastern's general education requirements, plus prerequisite science courses. The professional program is two years in length, excluding the Level II fieldwork. The professional curriculum is composed of two parts: a core curriculum that would be shared with other disciplines (and is already established at the university), and courses that are specific to the occupational therapy program.

Appendix A presents the draft program structure. A final mission statement, philosophy of education, and course syllabi for the occupational therapy courses would need to be developed by the program director and faculty selected for the BOT.

Goals

The broad goal of the proposed BOT is expressed in the draft mission statement for the program:

"The baccalaureate program in occupational therapy at Eastern Washington University prepares occupational therapists to work with people who have physical illness or injury, social or emotional difficulties, congenital or developmental problems, or who are in need of preventative strategies that promote well-being. A specific focus of the program is to prepare occupational therapists to work in rural and other medically under-served communities in an interdisciplinary and collaborative manner with other medical and health professionals. Students who graduate from the baccalaureate program in occupational therapy are expected to have the knowledge and skills to practice in the diverse settings in which occupational therapy is used for assessment and intervention, including those which serve the poor, the rurally isolated, and members of diverse minority/ethnic groups."

Student Learning Outcomes

As stated in the proposal, students completing Eastern's BOT would be competent to:

- *Use the process and methods of occupational therapy to work with people who have physical illness or injury, social or emotional difficulties, congenital or developmental problems, or who are in need of preventive strategies that promote well being;*
- *Synthesize theoretical and empirical knowledge from occupational therapy, scientific, psychosocial, and humanistic disciplines, and integrate it into practice;*

- *Use reasoning, judgment, and leadership skills necessary to identify problems, develop solutions to problems, implement these solutions, and evaluate the effectiveness of these solutions;*
- *Serve the health needs of a variety of populations in a changing society, including those who are elderly, culturally diverse, and/or disadvantaged;*
- *Evaluate and apply research findings to the variety of occupational therapy roles;*
- *Participate with other health care providers and the public in promoting the health and well being of society;*
- *Function in an increasingly complex, interdisciplinary health care system;*
- *Support the team practice concept for providing the highest quality care for all patients;*
- *Incorporate the moral and ethical values/behaviors necessary for effective performance of responsibilities as an occupational therapist; and*
- *Continue the learning process through graduate education and/or specialty training, as appropriate.*

Students

It is expected that the BOT initially would serve 25 FTE students and grow to serve 50 FTE students at full enrollment. These students should be able to complete the professional program, plus Level II fieldwork in about two and one half years. The first class is targeted to begin January 2000.

Resources

A total of four FTE teaching faculty would be hired for the BOT. A program director, chairperson, and support staff would support them.

An initial allocation of \$10,000 would be granted to establish basic library resources for the BOT and annual allocations would also be made to enhance the collection. Initially the program would be housed on the EWU Cheney campus; it would move to the Riverpoint Health Sciences Building when it is completed. An initial allocation of \$20,000 per year for two years would be made to purchase occupational therapy equipment. Future equipment acquisitions, maintenance, and upgrades are budgeted at \$4,000 annually.

Diversity Plan

The diversity plan in the proposal states, *“In order to insure that students from minority groups and medically under-served areas apply to the program, the program will recruit extensively in the rural areas in the region, and at community colleges serving rural and minority students from medically under-served areas. The presence of the university’s active minority programs, and services for students with disabilities, will be included in all recruitment efforts. University faculty will make visits to high schools and community colleges in medically under-served areas to provide information to likely students.”*

QUALITY OF PROGRAM

Accreditation

Eastern intends to seek accreditation for its proposed Bachelor of Occupational Therapy with the Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education (ACOTE) within the American Occupational Therapy Association (AOTA). The initial accreditation process requires that new programs apply for and be granted “Developing Program Status” prior to the admission of the first class of students into the program. The three steps of the accreditation process for new programs are:

Step 1. Review of Application for Developing Program Status

The review of the Application for Developing Program Status and Development plans results either in granting or denying Developing Program Status. Although the designation “Developing Program Status” is not a guarantee of accreditation, it does indicate that the plan is substantially in compliance with the *Essentials and Guidelines for an Accredited Educational program for the Occupational Therapist* for the proposed program. The designation also indicates that resource allocation appears to meet the *Essentials* if fully implemented as planned. Developing Program status must be granted before students may be admitted or notified of admission to the program, and is required in order for the program to proceed to Step 2.

Step 2. Initial Review

The Initial Review of the program’s Report of Self-Study results either in granting, denying, or deferring action on a Letter of Review. Granting of a Letter of Review indicates that on the basis of the paper review of the submitted materials, ACOTE has determined that the program is likely to meet the *essentials* if fully implemented in accordance with its plan. The granting of a Letter of Review is not a guarantee of accreditation status. The program timeline must allow time for submission of the Initial Report of Self-Study to occur after the students have completed some coursework in the OT curriculum component.

Step 3. The Initial On-Site Evaluation

The initial on-site evaluation results either in a status of Accreditation or Accreditation Withheld.

Because graduation from an accredited educational program is a requirement of eligibility for certification by the National Board for Certification in Occupational Therapy and for licensure in most states, every effort is made to assure that the three-step accreditation process is complete prior to the graduation of the first class of students. Because substantial time would be required to complete the Development Plan, ACOTE strongly encourages early submission of the Letter of Intent. It is also strongly recommended that the program director be hired in sufficient time to be instrumental in preparing the program’s Development Plan.

Assessment

The assessment plans for the program’s effectiveness and expected student learning outcomes appear in Appendix B. They are in keeping with ACOTE and HECB standards.

External Review

In carrying out the Board's program approval responsibilities, HECB staff relies to a large extent on external reviews conducted by experts in the discipline, peer reviews conducted by Washington's public baccalaureate institutions, and professional program accreditation standards. HECB staff assesses whether the external and peer reviews generally support the proposal, or raise substantive concerns and issues that need to be addressed by the proposing institution. HECB staff also assesses whether the proposed program is in compliance with accreditation standards.

The BOT was reviewed by two external reviewers: Toby Ballou Hamilton, Assistant Professor and Program Director of the Department of Occupational Therapy at the University of Oklahoma; and Charlotte Royeen, Associate Dean for Research and Professor in Occupational Therapy at Creighton University. Both external reviewers urged Eastern to seriously consider offering a master's degree rather than a bachelor's degree. In addition, the external reviewers shared a number of substantive concerns. Appendix C includes Eastern's responses to the external reviewers. They were prepared by Dr. Elizabeth Kohler, an occupational therapist consultant who is working with Eastern as they develop their BOT. Dr. Kohler's experiences, both nationally and internationally, have allowed her to design, direct, and teach for occupational therapy and rehabilitation training programs.

Central Washington University (CWU), Western Washington University (WWU), and Washington State University (WSU) chose to comment on the BOT. Their comments are presented below.

- CWU...*"We support Eastern Washington University's efforts and wish them success as they pursue the establishment of this program. "*
- WWU...*"While Western Washington University continues to have reservations about the proposal to initially establish the program at the bachelor's level, we are also aware of the strong current and future demand for occupational therapists, and support EWU's proposal to provide appropriate and necessary educational opportunities for therapists in Washington State."*
- WSU...*"More recently EWU has provided additional information about their plans not only to begin the baccalaureate degree in occupational therapy in a way that will respond quickly to the enormous need for occupational therapists, but also transition rapidly to a master's program as the profession moves in that direction. We would like to support initially offering the program at the baccalaureate level, both as a significant component of the Health Sciences Consortium in Spokane and for the contribution it will make to the region."*

Furthermore, HECB staff has compared Eastern's proposed BOT with the standards established by ACOTE. At this juncture it appears that the proposed program shows promise in meeting the accrediting association's standards. As mentioned previously, there is remaining work that needs to be accomplished once the BOT program director and faculty are hired.

Finally, HECB staff has consulted with AOTA regarding the debate between offering bachelor's versus master's level training in occupational therapy. During the proceedings of the April 1999 National AOTA conference, the Council on Education (COE) as well as the Council on the Profession (COP) will present proposed accreditation changes. All parties are trying to move toward membership consensus to move the profession to an entry-level master's degree for OT practitioners. These proposed changes reflect years of debate and task force work concerning the shape of the profession into the next millennium. Essentially, the proposed changes are as follows:

- 2000 will be the last year to accept applications for a bachelor's level OT program;
- 2004 will be the last year to graduate a bachelor's level student into the profession;
- By 2005 all OT schools must move to offering entry-level master's for the initial degree in occupational therapy; and
- By 2005 all OT program directors must possess a doctorate.

Eastern is keenly aware of the likelihood of these proposed changes. When future accreditation requirements dictate an entry-level master's, the university will pursue that change to maintain its occupational therapy program.

COST OF PROGRAM

Initially, the program would be supported by state funds currently held in allotment reserve. In future years, it is expected that the program would be supported by external grants as well. For example, OT programs oftentimes collaborate with schools of technology and engineering to seek grant funding for creating adaptive environments for persons with disabilities.

The estimated cost to offer the program is about \$314,164 per year; \$6,283 per FTE student at full enrollment. Details on the program costs are outlined in Appendix D.

PROPOSAL ANALYSIS

1. EWU's proposed Bachelor of Occupational Therapy has the potential to address significantly the demand for occupational therapists, especially in rural areas of the Inland Northwest.
2. EWU's proposal presents a limited outline of the program; the program's mission statement, philosophy of education, and course syllabi are not finalized at this point. A program director and faculty need to be hired to complete these tasks.
3. EWU would seek accreditation for its proposed Bachelor of Occupational Therapy with the Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education (ACOTE) within the American Occupational Therapy Association (AOTA). At this juncture it appears that the proposed program shows promise in meeting the accrediting association's standards.

RECOMMENDATION

Conditional approval is recommended for Eastern Washington University's proposed Bachelor of Occupational Therapy, effective immediately. Final approval is recommended upon receipt of the following: a) the vitae of the program director and program faculty, b) a final mission statement and philosophy of education for the program, c) course syllabi for the occupational therapy courses, d) other changes to the program requested by the program director and program faculty, and e) the acquisition of "*developing program status*" with the Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education (ACOTE) within the American Occupational Therapy Association (AOTA).

APPENDICES

Appendix A	Program Structure
Appendix B	Assessment Plan
Appendix C	EWU Response to External Reviews
Appendix D	Program Costs

RESOLUTION NO. 98-56

WHEREAS, Eastern Washington University has requested HECB approval to establish a Bachelor of Occupational Therapy; and

WHEREAS, There appears to be high student interest and professional community need for occupational therapists, especially in rural areas of the Inland Northwest; and

WHEREAS, The program is expected to make significant contributions to the welfare of the health care industry; and

WHEREAS, The program would seek accreditation with the Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education within the American Occupational Therapy Association; and

WHEREAS, The program would be supported by significant resources at a reasonable cost; and

WHEREAS, The diversity and assessment plans are suitable for a program of this nature;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board conditionally approves the Eastern Washington University request to offer a Bachelor of Occupational Therapy, effective immediately; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That final approval should be granted upon receipt of the following: a) the vitae of the program director and program faculty, b) a final mission statement and philosophy of education for the program, c) course syllabi for the occupational therapy courses, d) other changes to the program requested by the program director and program faculty, and e) the acquisition of "developing program status" with the Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education within the American Occupational Therapy Association.

Adopted:

December 7, 1998

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

**WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY-VANCOUVER PROPOSAL TO
ESTABLISH A BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN
NATURAL RESOURCE SCIENCES**

December 1998

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Washington State University-Vancouver proposes to offer a **Bachelor of Science in Natural Resource Sciences**. The program is an extension of the undergraduate program in natural resource sciences on the WSU-Pullman campus. It will be delivered via on-site faculty at the WSU-Vancouver campus and distance learning technologies.

The program is expected to draw students who graduate from nearby community colleges. The program also may attract workers who need a bachelor's degree in order to advance in their careers. Students will acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to **understanding and managing the natural resource base**.

The **diversity plan** for the program is exemplary and reflects WSU's commitment to serve students of color and to employ strategies that will enhance learning for all program participants. The **assessment plan** illustrates WSU's commitment to evaluate student performance and program effectiveness.

The BS in Natural Resource Sciences would be funded through a combination of **internal reallocation and new state funds**. It would be supported by existing resources as well as one new FTE faculty. The cost of this program should be about **\$10,367 per FTE student**.

RECOMMENDATION

The Washington State University-Vancouver proposal to establish a Bachelor of Science in Natural Resource Sciences at its branch campus is recommended for approval, effective immediately.

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY-VANCOUVER PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN NATURAL RESOURCE SCIENCES

October 1998

BACKGROUND

Washington State University-Vancouver is proposing to offer a Bachelor of Science in Natural Resource Sciences. It is an existing program at WSU's main campus in Pullman. Since 1996, WSU-Vancouver has offered a Bachelor of Science in Environmental Studies and there is a demonstrated need for a discrete, complementary undergraduate program in natural resource sciences. Courses for the proposed program would be delivered by on-site faculty and distance learning technologies.

NEED FOR PROGRAM

Definition

Natural resource sciences programs focus primarily on understanding and managing the natural resource base by integrating ecological and socioeconomic principles. Such programs prepare individuals for careers and/or graduate studies that emphasize the application of science to the understanding, management, and conservation of natural resources.

Relationship to Program Plan

In March 1997, the HECB pre-approved the program. The proposal has undergone all of the internal approvals at WSU, including the approval of the faculty senate.

Relationship to Role and Mission

The proposed program will support WSU's mission statement, which reads, in part,

"Recognizing its unique land-grant research and education mission to the people of Washington and the state's increasing global involvement, the University provides leadership in discovering, accessing and disseminating knowledge through high quality research, instruction and extension that contribute to safe, abundant food and fiber supply; promote the well-being of individuals, families and communities; enhance sustainability of agricultural and economic systems; and promote stewardship of natural resources and ecological systems."

Relationship to Other Institutions

Table 1 displays programs with a general natural resource or environmental emphasis offered by other four-year institutions in Washington. Unlike the proposed WSU-Vancouver natural resource sciences program, these related programs primarily focus on either the related field of environmental science, upon a combination of environmental science/natural resource sciences, or upon a specific sub-field of natural resources.

Table 1: Natural Resource/ Environmental Programs in Washington

Institution	Programs
UW	BS Forest Resources
TESC	BA/BS Environmental Studies
WWU	BA Environmental Studies BA Planning & Environmental Policy BS Environmental Science

Occupational and Graduate School Opportunities

WSU-Vancouver representatives report that there will be plentiful opportunities for employment in the region for natural resource sciences graduates. Typically, such graduates engage in careers within four general categories:

1. Careers in Natural Resource Management and Services;
2. Careers in Natural Resource Policy Administration;
3. Careers in Natural Resource Education; and
4. Careers in Natural Resource Science

Employment offices in the Vancouver area estimate about 20 openings per year for conservation and/or forestry-related personnel, and approximately 100 openings per year for managerial positions in engineering/math/science in the region. The natural resource emphasis of the curriculum and the math and science breadth of the curriculum should qualify graduates for these positions.

Washington's natural resource systems are extremely important to the state, and careful stewardship is required if natural resources are to be sustained in light of societal needs. The Governor's 2010 Task Force identifies protection of the resource base in Washington to be a high priority, and the U.S. Forest Service planning documents emphasize stewardship of forest resources. The President's Northwest Forest Plan and the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project emphasize the importance of appropriate management of natural resources in Washington for economic vitality, environmental quality, and public well-being. These mandates illustrate the growing demand for natural resource sciences graduates.

WSU-Vancouver representatives also report that the strength and breadth of the curriculum's base in social and bio-physical sciences should qualify graduates to pursue graduate studies in a variety of fields including forestry, wildlife science, plant/animal ecology, agronomy/horticulture, sociology, political science, and law.

Student Interest

Student interest in the program is adequate. Both Clark and Lower Columbia Community Colleges have indicated strong student and faculty interest in the Natural Resource Sciences program at the WSU-Vancouver campus. These community colleges, and others as well, have expressed keen interest in direct coordination of their two-year curricula with the Natural Resource Sciences degree proposed for WSU-Vancouver. In addition, seven natural resource sciences courses are currently offered at WSU-Vancouver. In aggregate, enrollment in these courses has been high – 577 students – since 1991.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Program Goals

As outlined in the proposal, goals for this program areas follows:

1. To provide students with integrated, interdisciplinary education in natural resources sciences that is relevant to current and future needs of society and the resource base upon which society depends;
2. To provide instruction in broadly based liberal arts, humanities, and basic science education;
3. To develop students' skills in management, critical thinking, problem solving, and cultural understanding; and
4. To provide students with competencies in specific field of major emphasis in natural resource sciences.

Curriculum

Appendix A presents the program of study. It is essentially the same as the corresponding WSU-Pullman program. All natural resource sciences majors will complete a core of basic natural resource courses; a core of courses specific to the major; and an array of approved elective courses.

Students

Program Size. The program will initially enroll 10 FTE and reach full size of 28 students.

Time-to-Degree. The time-to-degree for full-time students is expected to be 4-to-5 semesters.

Diversity

WSU's Department of Natural Resources' commitment to diversity is exemplary, as illustrated in the following statement:

The Department of Natural Resource sciences is dedicated to a positive learning and working environment. We value and are sensitive to human diversity in the broadest sense, and promote a learning/working climate that fosters understanding and respect for such diversity.

In 1996, the department established a task force to identify specific strategies to attain the University's diversity goals. Such efforts include:

1. Providing special support for nurturing and retaining students from under-represented groups;
2. Developing student recruitment programs targeted to specific under-represented groups with known/anticipated interest in natural resources, particularly women and Native Americans;
3. Maintaining required curricular elements within which diversity issues are integral to course content;
4. Incorporating diverse perspectives/contributions within science courses required in the curriculum; and
5. Providing faculty training in fostering learning environments that are positive from a diversity viewpoint.

Resources

Initially, instruction and advising will be provided by existing FTE faculty. As the program matures, one other FTE faculty will be added. Administration and support services staff will be handled essentially through existing means. Additional library resources will need to be acquired to support the program. The costs associated with the additional collection are estimated to be \$4,000 annually.

QUALITY OF PROGRAM

Assessment Plan

In accordance with HECB and WSU guidelines, assessment will consist of activities within five areas:

1. Evaluation of student baseline data upon program entry.
2. Intermediate assessment of student quantitative and writing skills.
3. End-of-program student assessment.
4. Post-graduation assessment.
5. Periodic program review.

Appendix B outlines the assessment plan in greater detail.

External Review

The proposal does not constitute a new curriculum for the natural resource sciences program. Given this, no external review of the proposal is required. To date, no comments regarding the program have been received from Washington's other public baccalaureate institutions.

COST OF PROGRAM

Appendix C provides an estimated cost of the program. It will be supported through a combination of internal reallocation and new state funds. It should be noted that costs are slightly higher in later years of the program due to hiring additional faculty to serve more students enrolled in the program. In the first year, the cost per FTE student will be \$25,352, and at full enrollment the cost will decrease dramatically to \$10,367. In comparison, the 1993-1994 Education Cost Study (HECB 1995) reported that the annual average FTE (AAFTE) costs for upper-division agriculture and natural resource programs was \$9,591.

STAFF ANALYSIS

WSU-Vancouver's proposed Bachelor of Science will introduce a degree program that should be attractive to southwest Washington residents and employers. Regional occupational demand and student interest have been demonstrated. The program will add sufficient resources to ensure quality services for faculty and students participating in the program. It will provide students with an education that will prepare them to engage in numerous careers and/or graduate studies.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommend that the Board approve WSU's request to establish a Bachelor of Science in Natural Resource Sciences at the WSU-Vancouver branch campus, effective immediately.

APPENDICES

Appendix A Program of Study
Appendix B Assessment Plan
Appendix C Program Costs

For a copy of the appendices, please call the HECB at (360)753-7830.

RESOLUTION NO. 98-54

WHEREAS, Washington State University has requested approval to establish a Bachelor of Science in Natural Resource Sciences at the WSU-Vancouver branch campus; and

WHEREAS, The program will support the university's mission to enhance sustainability of agricultural and economic systems, and promote stewardship of natural resources and ecological systems; and

WHEREAS, There appears to be sufficient student interest in, and demand for, the program; and

WHEREAS, The program will support additional resources to ensure quality services for students and faculty alike participating in the program; and

WHEREAS, At full enrollment the program costs will be reasonable;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the Washington State University-Vancouver proposal to establish a Bachelor of Science in Natural Resource Sciences, effective immediately.

Adopted:

December 7, 1998

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

WESTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A MASTER OF ARTS IN REHABILITATION COUNSELING

December 1998

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Western Washington University is proposing to establish a **Master of Arts in Rehabilitation Counseling**. This new program will be the **first of its kind in Washington State**. It will serve the training needs for rehabilitation professionals in Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington.

Rehabilitation counselors work in public or private agencies, providing counseling, case management, job placement, advocacy, and related services to individuals with disabilities who are pursuing vocational and/or independent living objectives. In Washington State there are three major rehabilitation service agencies.

1. Department of Services for the Blind
2. Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
3. Department of Labor and Industries

Each of these agencies employs hundreds of rehabilitation counselors and serves hundreds of clients. Each of these agencies, and several others as well, submitted strong letters of support, endorsing the establishment of WWU's program.

The **diversity plan** values, encourages, and supports diversity among students, faculty and staff. The **assessment plan is outstanding** and reflects the expected student learning outcomes developed by the Council on Rehabilitation Education.

The MA in Rehabilitation Counseling will be supported by state funds and external grants. Existing WWU faculty, administrative staff, and support personnel will support the program, whose **cost per FTE student would be about \$4,550**.

RECOMMENDATION

The Western Washington University proposal to offer a Master of Arts in Rehabilitation Counseling is recommended for approval, effective fall 1999.

**WESTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A
MASTER OF ARTS IN REHABILITATION COUNSELING**

December 1998

BACKGROUND

Western Washington University (WWU) is proposing to establish a Master of Arts in Rehabilitation Counseling. This new program will be supported by WWU's highly regarded Center for Continuing Education in Rehabilitation. The Center has a 20 year history of excellence in a variety of training and educational programs. Annually, it has been awarded about \$1 million in U.S. Department of Education grant funding. The Center is the primary training and educational resource for rehabilitation professionals in Federal Region X – Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington.

NEED FOR PROGRAM

Definition

The Master of Arts in Rehabilitation Counseling provides individuals with the essential knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary to function effectively as professional rehabilitation counselors. Rehabilitation counselors work in public or private agencies, providing counseling, case management, job placement, advocacy, and related services to individuals with disabilities who are pursuing vocational and/or independent living objectives.

Relationship to Institutional Role and Mission

WWU reports, "Western Washington University has adopted a strategic plan which defines the university's goals as quality, diversity, and community service. The implementation of the MA in Rehabilitation Counseling relates to each of these goals, especially community service. Community service is the essence of rehabilitation counseling as a profession and as an academic discipline. While enrolled in graduate study, rehabilitation counseling students perform public service through practica and internships, which are usually unpaid, and which are completed in community agencies."

Relationship to Program Plan

In March 1997, the Board granted the program pre-approval status.

Program Alternatives

No institution in Washington State offers a master's degree with a major in rehabilitation counseling.

Occupational Demand

The need for master's level training in rehabilitation counseling stems from workforce needs. As reported in the 1996-1997 *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, there is significant occupational demand for rehabilitation counselors.

- *“Overall employment of counselors is expected to grow faster than the average for all occupations through the year 2005. Rehabilitation counselors should be in strong demand. Under managed care systems, insurance companies increasingly provide for reimbursement of counselors, enabling many counselors to move from schools and government agencies to private practice. Counselors are also forming group practices to receive expanded insurance coverage.”*
- *“The number of people who need rehabilitation services will rise as advances in medical technology continue to save lives that only a few years ago would have been lost. In addition, legislation requiring equal employment rights for persons with disabilities will spur demand for counselors. Counselors not only will help individuals with disabilities with their transition into the workforce, but also will help companies comply with the law.”*
- *“An increasing number of employers are also offering employees assistance programs which provide mental health and alcohol and drug abuse services. More rehabilitation and mental health counselors will be needed as the elderly population grows, and as society focuses on ways of developing mental well-being, such as controlling stress associated with job and family responsibilities.”*

In Washington State, there are three major rehabilitation service agencies. These are the Department of Services for the Blind, the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, and the Department of Labor and Industries. Each of these agencies has submitted letters of support, endorsing the establishment of WWU's proposed master's program in rehabilitation counseling. The preference for counselors with graduate-level training is based on the fact that this training contributes significantly to superior work performance and improved effectiveness in the delivery of rehabilitation services.

Student Interest

Student interest for graduate-level training in rehabilitation counseling stems from two primary needs: 1) the need for training which leads to enhanced skills; 2) the need to acquire credentials leading to promotions and advanced career opportunities. Since the 1994-1995 academic year, WWU has responded, in part, to these needs by offering a concentration in rehabilitation counseling. To date, the concentration has produced 17 graduates and currently enrolls 17 students. It is expected that student interest will increase beyond current levels when a master's level major in the field is available.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Curriculum

Appendix A displays the courses for the program. The curriculum is consistent with the academic standards developed by the Council on Rehabilitation Education (CORE). CORE is the nationally recognized accrediting association for master's level training in rehabilitation counseling. proposed program will seek CORE accreditation.

In addition to course work, rehabilitation counseling students will be required to complete a practicum and an internship. They will also be required to complete and pass a comprehensive written examination as a requirement for graduation. This test will draw from the entire body of course work and applied field experiences which students have completed in their program of study. This will include content related to research methodology and analytical procedures, as well as theory pertaining to counseling, assessment, job placement, and case management.

Goals

As stated in the proposal, *“The goal of the Master of Arts in Rehabilitation Counseling is to provide the highest possible quality of training for rehabilitation counselors so that students and graduates develop the skills which allow for the highest quality and most effective services for individuals with disabilities.”*

Students

Size of Program. The program is designed to accommodate 20-30 students.

Time-to-Degree. A full-time student who enrolls continuously will be able to complete the degree program in two years. A part-time student will have a maximum of five years to earn the degree.

Diversity

Program personnel report that the MA in Rehabilitation Counseling will continue to value and encourage diversity among students, faculty, and staff. Among the 17 current students in the rehabilitation counseling concentration, 12 percent are minorities, 12 percent are individuals with disabilities, and 88 percent are women. Among the 17 rehabilitation counseling concentration graduates, 6 percent are minorities, 24 percent are individuals with disabilities, and 65 percent are women.

Diversity will be further encouraged via a five-year grant from the U.S. Department of Education. This grant supports scholarships for rehabilitation counseling students. To date, the 16 scholarship recipients include 13 percent minorities, 31 percent individuals with disabilities, and 75 percent women.

Resources

Existing administrative staff, support personnel, and faculty will support the program. Instruction and field experience supervision will be provided by two full-time and one part-time doctoral-level faculty. Students will also have opportunities to take a few classes from adjunct faculty who possess special expertise. Other program resources will be provided essentially through existing means.

QUALITY OF PROGRAM

Accreditation

The Commission on Rehabilitation Education (CORE) is the accrediting association for graduate-level rehabilitation counseling programs. WWU will seek accreditation with this association for its proposed program.

Assessment

The assessment plan for the program is presented in Appendix B. It specifies various indicators of progress and achievement related to program objectives as well as specific student learning outcomes for students and how they will be measured.

External Reviews

The MA in Rehabilitation Counseling was reviewed by two external expert reviewers:

- **Dr. Jerry Fischer, Coordinator of the master's program in rehabilitation counseling at the University of Idaho.** Dr. Fischer is the Region X Representative to the Board of Directors of the National Council on Rehabilitation Education. In his review of WWU's proposal he stated, *"The need for the program has been well demonstrated. The program will provide students with nationally recognized credentials enabling them to serve the state's population of people with disabilities with the highest care possible. Furthermore, the program is in the unique and enviable situation of being able to capitalize on the resources of the Center for Continuing Education in Rehabilitation for Rehabilitation Service Administration Region X."*
- **Dr. Garth Eldredge, Coordinator of master's and doctoral level training in rehabilitation counseling at Utah State University.** Dr. Eldredge directs the administrative office of the National Council on Rehabilitation Education and is an officer and surveyor for the Commission on Rehabilitation Education. In his review of WWU's proposal he said, *"I am in full support of the proposed rehabilitation counseling master's degree at Western Washington University. It is a sound program, and the staff are eminently qualified to deliver the training program."*

The proposal was also reviewed by the public four-year institutions in Washington. Eastern Washington University and the University of Washington endorse HECB approval for the proposal and wish WWU well in its new endeavor.

COST OF PROGRAM

A summary of program costs is illustrated in Appendix C. The MA in Rehabilitation Counseling will be supported by state funds and grants, particularly grants from the U.S. Department of Education. At full enrollment, the cost per FTE student will be approximately \$4,550.

PROGRAM ANALYSIS

The proposal is based on industry needs that WWU has carefully assessed. The curriculum would provide students with a high quality program. Faculty participating in the proposed program are highly regarded in the field. In addition, the assessment plan is exemplary. Finally, the costs associated with the program are reasonable and represent a wise use of state resources.

RECOMMENDATION

The Western Washington University proposal to offer a Master of Arts in Rehabilitation Counseling is recommended for approval, effective fall 1999.

APPENDICES

Appendix A	Program of Study
Appendix B	Assessment Plan
Appendix C	Program Costs

For a copy of the appendices, please call the HECB at (360)753-7830.

RESOLUTION NO. 98-55

WHEREAS, Western Washington University has requested approval to establish a Master of Arts in Rehabilitation Counseling; and

WHEREAS, The program will provide the only graduate-level rehabilitation counseling program in Washington State; and

WHEREAS, the program addresses the escalating need for rehabilitation counselors in the public and private sectors; and

WHEREAS, The program of study is designed to meet the academic standards and student learning outcomes articulated by the Council on Rehabilitation Education; and

WHEREAS, The external reviews attest to the need and quality of the program; and

WHEREAS, The costs are reasonable for offering this graduate program;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the Western Washington University request to offer a Master of Arts in Rehabilitation Counseling, effective fall 1999.

Adopted:

December 7, 1998

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

**EASTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY PROPOSAL TO OFFER A BACHELOR OF
ARTS IN INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES: ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP AT
LIBERTY LAKE AND WALLA WALLA**

December 1998

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Eastern Washington University seeks approval to offer a **Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies: Organizational Leadership** at **Liberty Lake** and **Walla Walla**, in recognition of the growing importance for higher education opportunities for returning adult learners.

Applicants to the Walla Walla program are expected to be employees at Washington State Penitentiary (WSP) and Walla Walla School District (WWSD); they would be graduates of Walla Walla Community College (WWCC). The WSP educational representative and the WWCC leadership team requested that EWU bring a bachelor's program in leadership to the area.

The programs would be delivered via face-to-face instruction and distance learning technologies at Telect and Johnson Matthey corporate facilities in Liberty Lake and at Walla Walla Community College in Walla Walla.

The interdisciplinary programs provide students with programs of study that emphasize communications, economics, management, marketing, business, technology, and liberal arts. Graduates of the programs would be well prepared to assume leadership positions in the workplace.

Student demand is indicated by the responses to surveys conducted in Liberty Lake and Walla Walla. There exists a strong local market for interdisciplinary studies graduates who possess advanced organizational leadership skills.

The **diversity plan** promotes the participation of people of color and those with disabilities in both programs. The **assessment plan** would focus attention on the continuous improvement of the programs of study, and successful learning experiences for all students enrolled in the programs.

The cost per student FTE enrolled in the Liberty Lake program is estimated at **\$5,149**; the cost per student FTE in the Walla Walla program is estimated to be **\$6,034**.

RECOMMENDATION

The Eastern Washington University request to establish a Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies: Organizational Leadership at Liberty Lake and at Walla Walla is recommended for approval, effective immediately.

**EASTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY PROPOSAL TO OFFER A BACHELOR OF
ARTS IN INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES: ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP AT
LIBERTY LAKE AND WALLA WALLA**

December 1998

INTRODUCTION

Eastern Washington University is proposing to offer a Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies: Organizational Leadership at Liberty Lake and Walla Walla. The program is designed to serve the needs of returning adult learners. The educational representative of the Washington State Penitentiary and the Walla Walla Community College leadership team requested that EWU bring a bachelor's program in leadership to the area. The program consists of a broad liberal core that builds upon students' prior experiential learning.

PROGRAM NEED

Definition

The program is a multidisciplinary major combining coursework in communications, economics, management, marketing, business, and technology. It addresses specific needs of adult learners interested in pursuing career options to fulfill leadership roles in the world of work.

Relationship to Role and Mission

The program supports EWU's mission *"...to prepare students to be literate, informed, and contributing citizens who think critically; write clearly; work cooperatively; solve problems creatively; use advanced technology effectively; and appreciate diversity."*

Relationship to Program Plan

In April 1998 the HECB granted the program pre-approval status.

Alternative Programs

Most public and private colleges and universities in Washington State offer undergraduate programs in interdisciplinary studies. However, EWU's proposed interdisciplinary program has several unique features:

1. It is tailored to meet high tech and manufacturing industry needs in Liberty Lake and Walla Walla.
2. It focuses on organizational leadership.
3. It includes a component for returning adult learners to acquire credit for prior learning.

4. It would be offered at Telect and Johnson Matthey corporate locations in Liberty Lake during the lunch hour, in the early evening, and via Internet and video classroom when appropriate.
5. It would be offered at Walla Walla Community College in the evening and on weekends, and via Internet and video classroom when appropriate.

Student Interest

Applicants to the Walla Walla program are expected to be employees at Washington State Penitentiary (WSP) and Walla Walla School District (WWSD). EWU conducted a survey during fall 1998, to assess the number of WSP and WWSD employees interested in earning a bachelor's degree. Of those surveyed, 52 (63%) employees indicated that they were interested in pursuing the BA in Interdisciplinary Studies degree, and 32 (39%) indicated that they were interested in pursuing individual courses.

Applicants to the Liberty Lake program are expected to be local corporation employees at Johnson Matthey, Telect, and other neighboring firms. Corporate human resource and training directors at these corporations and firms requested that EWU offer a business-related degree that allowed employees to receive credit for their life experiences through a portfolio course.

EWU conducted a survey during summer 1998, to assess the number of employees in the Liberty Lake area interested in earning a bachelor's degree. Of those surveyed, 222 (30%) employees indicated that they were very interested in pursuing a bachelor's degree and 220 (24%) indicated that they were somewhat interested.

Employer Appeal

Research indicates that employers view interdisciplinary studies graduates positively. They want employees who possess communications, decision-making, management, business, organizational, and technology skills. These are the objectives of the EWU proposed programs. Furthermore, research indicates that many occupations do not require directly related areas of specialization, but rather seek the interdisciplinary skills acquired in programs such as those proposed by EWU.

State Benefits

The state should benefit in several ways from the initiation of the proposed programs. First, the state is working to extend appropriate access for placebound and timebound residents. The proposed programs for Liberty Lake and Walla Walla would help address that need. Second, Walla Walla Community College graduates would have greater opportunities to transfer to an upper-division, local program that complements their daytime schedules. Third, graduates of the proposed programs would enhance the economic growth and financial profile of Eastern Washington.

Societal Benefits

Society also should benefit in several ways from the initiation of the proposed programs:

1. According to the *National Study on How, When, and Why Adults Go Back to School*, “Adult students — those students 25 years of age and older — now make up close to 50 percent of all college enrollments in the United States. The single most important reason for returning to college — reported by 90 percent of adults — dealt with the adult’s job/career. Adults return to school to gain new competencies in order to enter, change, or advance in their careers. Many learn just to keep up with current jobs.”
2. *Lifelong Learning Trends* notes, “Part-time students represent the fastest growing population in higher education. Now nearly half of all students enrolled at all levels in higher education attend part-time. In 1997, over one-third of all undergraduate-level and nearly two-thirds of master’s-level enrollments were part time. Between 1970 and 1997, part-time enrollments increased by 125 percent compared with 44 percent for full-time enrollments.”
3. According to the spring 1998 edition of *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, “While adult degree completion programs appear in many different forms, they are designed primarily for older, nontraditional students returning to college to complete their undergraduate degree. It is estimated that the number of nontraditional students returning to college to earn or complete a baccalaureate degree would continue to increase as America’s population grows older and as

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Goals

The BA in Interdisciplinary Studies: Organizational Leadership has identified the following goals:

1. Prepare students to communicate effectively with business and public sector professionals;
2. Provide students with advanced knowledge and skills in communication studies, business, economics,
3. Provide students with the principles of good leadership and practices; and
4. Prepare students to pursue a variety of careers in management, administration, personnel, and public relat

Curriculum

The program of study is exhibited in Appendix A. Students would be required to complete 60 to 65 credits of coursework and earn 25 to 30 credits through the portfolio process to attain the degree. The port of entry into the interdisciplinary program is the Portfolio Development course. In this course, students are assisted in preparing a portfolio that describes and documents the university-level learning they have acquired in their work and life experiences.

The programs would be offered using a combination of models, including on-line, face-to-face, and video classroom. Some classes would be offered via video classroom utilizing the K-20

Network and Internet/on-line. All classes would have some on-line component, from e-mail exchanges to chat rooms and list serves.

Size of Program

At full enrollment, each program would accommodate 11 FTE students.

Time- to- Degree

These part-time programs are designed to be completed in about three years.

QUALITY OF PROGRAM

Assessment Plan

Appendix B outlines the assessment plan for the proposed programs. It would be based on the American Council on Education's Assessment Guide for evaluating effective adult degree-completion programs.

Diversity Plan

The target audiences for the programs include employees at high tech and manufacturing firms in the Liberty Lake area, staff at the Washington State Penitentiary and Walla Walla School District, and Walla Walla Community College transfer students. These employers and the penitentiary are committed to hiring employees who reflect relevant skills and competencies, as well as the diversity of the population in the area. Similarly, the community college is committed to recruiting and graduating a diverse student population. EWU advisors would make every effort to guide individuals from all ethnic groups, and individuals with disabilities, to enroll in the BA in Interdisciplinary Studies: Organizational Leadership programs.

External Reviews

Since this major is not a new one, an external review by two experts in the field was not required. However, the proposal was distributed to the other five public baccalaureate institutions for review. Western Washington University responded positively to the proposal. No additional comments have been received from the other institutions.

Resources

The program would be supported, on a part-time basis, by an existing administrator and support staff. Courses would be taught, for the most part, by existing EWU faculty who are responsible for teaching the same courses on EWU's main campus. On an occasional basis, adjunct faculty would teach a few courses. Library resources could be accessed from the EWU library via mail, fax, or the Internet.

COST OF PROGRAM

The proposals for the BA in Interdisciplinary Studies: Organizational Leadership would be supported by internal reallocation based on reserve allotment funding. The cost per FTE student in the Liberty Lake program is estimated at \$5,149; the cost per FTE student in the Walla Walla program is estimated to be \$6,034. A summary of the budget for both programs is included in Appendix C.

STAFF ANALYSIS

EWU's Interdisciplinary Studies: Organizational Leadership programs would:

1. Provide needed higher education opportunities to returning adult learners;
2. Prepare individuals to assume leadership positions in a variety of public and private settings;
3. Be offered using a combination of models, including on-line, face-to-face, and K-20 classes.
4. Be supported through reallocation of state resources;
5. Have reasonable per-FTE-student costs; and
6. Respond to student interest and occupational demand.

RECOMMENDATION

The Eastern Washington University request to offer the Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies: Organizational Leadership at Liberty Lake and Walla Walla is recommended for approval, effective immediately.

APPENDICES

Appendix A	Program of Study
Appendix B	Assessment Plan
Appendix C	Program Costs

For a copy of the appendices, please call the HECB at (360)753-7830.

RESOLUTION NO. 98-54

WHEREAS, Eastern Washington University has requested to offer a Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies: Organizational Leadership at Liberty Lake and Walla Walla; and

WHEREAS, The programs would provide greater higher education opportunities to returning adult learners and prepare them to assume leadership positions in the workplace; and

WHEREAS, There is sufficient student interest and occupational demand for the programs; and

WHEREAS, The programs would be supported through internal reallocation of state resources and have reasonable costs per student FTE;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED That the Washington State Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the Eastern Washington University request to offer a Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies at Liberty Lake and Walla Walla, effective immediately.

Adopted:

December 7, 1998

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

RESOLUTION NO. 98-59

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board is required to adopt an annual schedule of regular meeting dates for publication in the State Register; and

WHEREAS, The Board reviewed a proposed schedule for 1999 at the December 7, 1998, meeting; and

WHEREAS, The proposed schedule has been modified in response to Board requests;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board hereby adopts as its 1999 meeting schedule, the attached calendar.

Adopted:

December 7, 1998

Attest:

Bob Craves, Chair

David Shaw, Secretary

1999 Board Meeting Schedule

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

<i>DAY/DATE</i>	<i>TYPE</i>	<i>TENTATIVE LOCATION</i>
Feb. 17 (Wed.)	Regular meeting	Olympia (legislative meetings/advocacy)
March	No meeting	
April 7 (Wed.)	Regular meeting	The Evergreen State College
May 18 (Tue.)	Regular meeting	WSU-Tri Cities
June	No meeting	
July 20 & 21 (Tue & Wed.)	Board retreat Regular meeting	(Leavenworth) – Wenatchee Valley Community College
August	No meeting	
Sept. 15 (Wed.)	Regular meeting	Olympia
Oct. 27 (Wed.)	Regular meeting	University of Washington
November	No meeting	
Dec. 1 or 8 (Wed.)	Regular meeting	FT. Lewis Ed. Center (committee weekend)